

Passive, (Therapy) - 100%

DRAWER 10C

71. 2009.06.25 03:00-11



Abraham Lincoln's Contemporaries

Theodore Roosevelt on Lincoln

Excerpts from newspapers and other
sources

From the files of the
Lincoln Financial Foundation Collection

The Outlook, Jan. 23, 1909.

NATIONAL CHARACTER AND THE CHARACTERS OF NATIONAL STATESMEN

BY THEODORE ROOSEVELT



AMONG the notable volumes of studies on social subjects which have appeared within the last year or two are Lord Acton's "History of Freedom and Other Essays," and Frederic Harrison's "National and Social Problems." The points of view of the two writers are very different in some regards, and it is not necessary to sympathize with every position which either of them takes; but running through both volumes is a vein of noble purpose which renders it worth while to read them both. Each writer is actuated by an intense scorn of what is base and cruel and unjust, without regard to whether it be successful or unsuccessful; each stands for true liberty, for social justice, for detestation of tyranny, whether of a despot, an oligarchy, or a mob; and, finally, the creed of each is based on a broad and deep ethical foundation, and tells us to believe in what is right because it is right, and bids us do right without regard to our own ultimate fate simply because an honest and upright man can do no less. Each of these men speaks with fiery and burning wrath of the successful criminals of history—the men who are worshiped by the admirers of mere success, no matter what brutality, greed, and cunning, what oppression of others and disregard of others, that success may represent.

They feel this healthy indignation alike for the unscrupulous plutocrat, the man of swollen wealth who exploits and ruins others to add to his own vast fortune, and for that other man, a no less sinister figure, who panders to the ignorance and envy of poor and unfortunate men, who excites class feeling and revels in mob violence, all to achieve his own wicked purpose. They abhor these men in social life, and they abhor their representatives in public life. They see clearly that the unscrupulous des-

pot and the unscrupulous mob leader are at heart one in their purposes, in their wickedness, in the far-reaching evil they bring about, though they must fight under banners nominally antagonistic. Louis XV and Marat represented each in his own person certain despicable human qualities, and each stood for selfish and brutal oppression of certain people by certain other people, of one class by another class; though by the accidents of their positions it happened that the classes they represented were not the same. Many a king, many a popular demagogue, though coming far short of such iniquity as that of those men, has yet each by his actions lowered the ideals of men within his own country; and as a corollary has lowered the ideals that men should have as to the way in which one country should treat another. One of the prime merits in the books both of Lord Acton and of Frederic Harrison is their clear recognition of international, no less than individual, morality and duty. Their writings are those of stanch patriots, stanch lovers of their own country, of far too virile fiber to shrink from righteous war if their country is wronged, but no less bent on seeing that their country wrongs no other.

A nation must be judged in part by the character of its public men, not merely by their ability but by their ideals and the measure in which they realize these ideals; by their attitude in private life, and much more by their attitude in public life, both as regards their conception of their duties toward their country, and their conception of the duty of that country, embodied in its government, toward its own people and toward foreign nations.

While the private life of a public man is of secondary importance, it is certainly a mistake to assume that it is of no importance. Of course excellence of private conduct—that is, domestic morality, punctuality in the payment of debts, being a

good husband and father, being a good neighbor—do not, taken together, furnish adequate reason for reposing confidence in a man as a public servant. But lack of these qualities certainly does establish a presumption against any public man. One function of any great public leader should be to exert an influence upon the community at large, especially upon the young men of the community; and therefore it is idle to say that those interested in the perpetuity of good government should not take into account the fact of a public man's example being something to follow or to avoid, even in matters not connected with his direct public services.

But of course the public services themselves furnish the real test. The first duty of a general is to win campaigns. The first duty of a statesman is efficiently to work for the betterment of his country and for its good relations with the rest of the world. He must have high ideals, and in addition he must possess the practical sagacity and force that will enable him measurably to realize them. If he does not possess the high ideals, then the greater his ability the more dangerous he is and the more essential it is to hunt him out of public life. Sagacity, courage, all that makes for efficiency—these are of use only if the man's character is such that he will use them for good and not for evil. On the other hand, fine aspirations, no matter how good, are useless if a man lacks either strength and courage, or else the practical good sense which will enable him to face facts as they actually are and to work with his fellows under existing conditions, instead of confining himself to complaints about the conditions, or to railing at the men because they are not other than he finds them.

It is the peculiar good fortune of the United States that in its two greatest citi-

zens, Washington and Lincoln, it has developed men whose ideals were lofty, not only as regards their conduct toward their fellow-citizens within the borders of their own land, but also as to the way in which their country should behave in dealing with other countries. These men were the greatest of their type, the type of Timoleon and Hampden, and it is no small honor to America that this, the highest type of statesmanship, should have here received its highest development. The fundamental difference between this type of public servant, the Washington-Lincoln type, and other types of public men as strong, as forceful, and as effective, is that the men of this type clearly recognize the fundamental principles of morality as applying among men and as applying among nations. They acknowledge moral obligations as of supreme force, and as binding them not only in their relations to their fellow-countrymen, but in their relations to all man kind. Both Washington and Lincoln were devoted Americans, devoted patriots. Each was willing to pour out the blood of the bravest and best in the land for a high and worthy cause, and each was a practical man, as far removed as possible from the sentimentalist and the doctrinaire. But each lived his life in accordance with a high ideal of right which forbade him to wrong his neighbor, and which when he became head of the State forbade him to inflict international wrong, as it forbade him to inflict private wrong. Each left to his countrymen as a priceless heritage the ennobling memory of a life which achieved great success through rendering far greater service, of a life lived in practical fashion for the achievement of lofty ideals, of a life lived in accordance with a standard of duty which forbade maltreatment of one man by another, which forbade maltreatment by one nation of another.

Roosevelt on Lincoln

President ROOSEVELT has given a very concise opinion of ABRAHAM LINCOLN in a letter to a friend, who publishes it. This is the letter:

NOVEMBER 30, 1908.

MY DEAR MR. MILNER: Yes, you are entirely right. But I had no idea that what I said was being reported. Great Heart is my favorite character in allegory (which is, of course, a branch of fiction, as you say), just as Bunyan's Pilgrim's Progress is to my mind one of the greatest books that ever were written; and I think that Abraham Lincoln is the ideal Great Heart of public life.

Charles A. ...

1/4/09

LINCOLN IDEAL PUBLIC SERVANT—ROOSEVELT

President Compares Him With
'Great Heart,' in Bunyan's
Work.

WRITES TO PREACHER

CHICAGO, Dec. 22.

"Great Heart," appearing in Bunyan's "Pilgrim's Progress," is President Roosevelt's favorite character in allegorical literature, the book itself is the greatest ever written and Abraham Lincoln was the ideal "Great Heart" of public life, according to a letter from the President received today by the Rev. Duncan Milner, a retired Presbyterian minister.

The President had been quoted to this effect, and Dr. Milner wrote to verify it. The letter reads:

My Dear Dr. Milner: Yes you are entirely right. But I had no idea that what I said was being reported. "Great Heart" is my favorite character in allegory (which is, of course, a branch of fiction, as you say), just as Bunyan's "Pilgrim's Progress" is, to my mind, one of the greatest books that ever was written, and I think that Abraham Lincoln is the ideal "Great Heart" of public life.

CONGER

President Roosevelt's Tribute to Lincoln

[From the Review of Reviews.]

2-7-1909

The White House, Washington, Jan. 1, 1909.—To the Editor of the Review of Reviews: The deeds and words of the great men of the nation, and above all the character of each of the foremost men of the nation, are one and all assets of inestimable value to the republic. Lincoln's work and Lincoln's words should be, and I think more and more are, part of those formative influences which tend to become living forces for good citizenship among our people. There is one of his letters which has always appealed to me particularly. It is the one running as follows:

Executive Mansion, Washington, D. C., Nov. 21, 1864.—To Mrs. Bixby, Boston, Mass.—Dear Madam: I have been shown in the files of the war department a statement of the adjutant general of Massachusetts that you are the mother of five sons who have died gloriously on the field of battle. I feel how weak and fruitless must be any word of mine which should attempt to beguile you from the grief of a loss so overwhelming. But I cannot refrain from tendering you the consolation that may be found in the thanks of the republic they died to save. I pray that our heavenly father may assuage the anguish of your bereavement, and leave you only the cherished memory of the loved and lost, and the solemn pride that must be yours to have laid so costly a sacrifice upon the

altar of freedom. Yours very sincerely and respectfully,
A. Lincoln.

Any man who has occupied the office of president realizes the incredible amount of administrative work with which the president has to deal even in time of peace. He is of necessity a very busy man, a much driven man, from whose mind there can never be absent for many minutes at a time the consideration of some problem of importance, or of some matter of less importance which yet causes worry and strain. Under such circumstances it is not easy for a president even in times of peace to turn from the affairs that are of moment to all the people and consider affairs that are of moment to but one person. While this is true of times of peace, it is, of course, infinitely more true of times of war. No president who has ever sat in the White House has borne the burden that Lincoln bore, or been under the ceaseless strain which he endured. It did not let up by day or by night. Ever he had to consider problems of the widest importance, ever to run risks of the greatest magnitude; and ever through and across his plans to meet these great dangers and great responsibilities was shot the woof of an infinite number of small worries

and small annoyances. He worked out his great task while unceasingly beset by the need of attending as best he could to a multitude of small tasks. It is a touching thing that the great leader, while thus driven and absorbed, could yet so often turn aside for the moment to do some deed of personal kindness; and it is a fortunate thing for the nation that in addition to doing so well each deed, great or small, he possessed that marvelous gift of expression which enabled him quite unconsciously to choose the very words best fit to commemorate each deed. His Gettysburg speech and his second inaugural are two of the half dozen greatest speeches ever made—I am tempted to call them the two greatest ever made. They are great in their wisdom and dignity and earnestness, and in a loftiness of thought and expression which makes them akin to the utterances of the prophets of the old testament. In a totally different way, but in strongest and most human fashion, such utterances as his answer to the serenaders immediately after his second election, and this letter which I have quoted above, appeal to us and make our hearts thrill. The mother to whom he wrote stood in one sense on a loftier plane of patriotism than the mighty president himself. Her memory, and the memory of her sons whom she bore to die for the union, should be kept green in our minds; for she and they, in life and death, typified all that is best and highest in our national existence. The deed itself, and the words of the great man which commemorate that deed, should

form one of those heritages for all Americans which it is of inestimable consequence that America should possess.
Theodore Roosevelt.



SOUTH HONORS LINCOLN

Veterans of Blue and Gray
at Memorial.

ROOSEVELT LAYS CORNERSTONE

Marble Hall to Mark Spot
Where Log Cabin Birth-
place of Martyred
President Stood.

New Haven Union Feb 12 '09.

Hodgenville, Ky., Feb. 12.—Standing on the spot where, 100 years ago, the soul of Abraham Lincoln came into the world, President Roosevelt laid the cornerstone of the marble memorial hall that is to rise, a shelter for the little log cabin in which the martyr president was born and a shrine for the American people.

General Luke E. Wright, the secretary of war who fought in the army of the south, delivered the address on behalf of the Confederate army. To mark still more the cessation of sectional strife, a southern Methodist bishop, Galloway, from Mississippi, pronounced the benediction.

Participating also in the exercises and delivering addresses were Gov. Folk of Missouri, the president of the National Lincoln Farm association; Gen. James Grant Wilson, who spoke on behalf of the Federal army, and Gov. Willson, representing the state of Kentucky. And among the thousands who had journeyed to the farm were many veterans of the Civil war on both sides. The granite cornerstone holds important documents relative to the history of the Lincoln farm, the life of Abraham Lincoln from the cradle to the grave, and a complete account of the ceremonies attending the centennial celebration.

The crowds that invaded Hodgenville for the celebration began coming last night. From the country for miles around they journeyed in vehicles of every description. Huge farm wagons, old carry-alls, trim buggies, the colored inhabitant driving the lowly mule. Assembled in Hodgenville were the closed carriages for the President and his party and the invited guests. Automobiles from the city honked and chugged. Every vehicle that could be used as a means of transportation had been pressed into service.

Shortly before 10 o'clock the first special train from Louisville, drew up

at the Illinois Central station. By the time these arrivals had dispersed the second special came, having on board a band of 20 pieces, provided by the Lincoln centenary committee, Company C, of the First regiment from Louisville, 18 cavalymen and about 50 newspaper correspondents from all parts of the country.

Following this came Robert Collier's special. Aboard it were Gov. Willson and staff, Gov. Folk, Gen. James Grant Wilson, Bishop Galloway, the members of the state committee, the official representatives of the Grand Army of the Republic, the United Confederate Veterans, the Spanish War Veterans, the Loyal Legion and the representatives of the city of Louisville.

This was followed by another special which completed the number of thousands who had gathered in Hodgenville for the exercises, and then came the arrival of the President's train.

Gen. Roger Williams of Lexington, who had been designated by Gov. Willson as chief marshal, had charge of arrangements. Mounted men were stationed along the road to the Lincoln farm to keep the way clear for the parade. The order had been given that after the President's train arrived no vehicle should leave the Lincoln farm for Hodgenville.

The ceremonies started as soon as the President and his party reached the tent, a huge canvas capable of accommodating 6,000, which has been erected for the purpose. The ground under foot was covered with cinders and sawdust. At one end of the tent was the speaker's stand and Lincoln cabin in full view of the vast audience. Only a week ago the timbers of the historic structure, which have traveled about the country, were taken out of a Louisville warehouse and put together on the original site, where they will now stand, sheltered by their marble temple.

The cabin and the Lincoln spring nearby were decorated with national colors. Every visitor wanted a drink at the spring, and the crowd had to form a line, each waiting his turn. A stone arch has been placed over this spring, which still flows as copiously as ever.

Many of the visitors stopped at Hodgenville on their way to the farm to see the site of the Lincoln statue, for which Congress appropriated \$10,000 and Larue county \$2,500, and which will be unveiled the latter part of May.

Of the memorial hall itself, all they beheld was the beginning of the foundation, which is of concrete.

Aside from the speakers, the guests of honor were Mrs. Ben Hardin Helm of Louisville, a half-sister of Mrs. Abraham Lincoln, and Robert Collier of New York, who purchased the Lin-

coln farm and started the movement for the national memorial.

Not only was sectional feeling blotted out today, but an effort at least was made to forget race and political prejudice. A committee of 26 negro citizens of Kentucky appointed by Gov. Willson were present on the reception committee, the race from which Lincoln struck the bonds of slavery. The Democratic and Republican state committees made the trip to Hodgenville together.

The centenary was observed all over the state. In accordance with Gov. Willson's suggestion, many communities held public meetings at which the Gettysburg and the first inaugural addresses were read. The business men of Hodgenville made every effort to see that the crowd that came was not forced to pay exorbitant prices. The charge for the round trip to the Lincoln farm was fixed at \$1 and 10 cents was the limit for a cup of coffee or a sandwich. Nearly every resident of Hodgenville has temporarily gone into the hotel and restaurant business, otherwise many of those who failed to bring their lunches with them would have gone hungry. Everywhere was exemplified a spirit of Kentucky hospitality.

Governor Folk as president of the National Lincoln Farm association, opened the speechmaking. The laying of the cornerstone and President Roosevelt's address followed. Gov. Willson of Kentucky and Secretary Wright followed in the order named, and Bishop Galloway of Mississippi pronounced the benediction.

Governor Willson said in part:

"To the President of the United States:

"The commonwealth of Kentucky, one of the first twin-daughters of the Union, and all of her people gives most cordial salute and welcome and not less to Theodore Roosevelt, first citizen, loved trustee and honored of the people. To all of the people of the Union here splendidly represented by our distinguished visitors and guests and to the men of the Lincoln Farm association, we give greeting and rejoice to have you with us in Kentucky and to join you in this endeavor and in all the inspirations and associations of this time and place.

"We have met here on this farm, where he was born in memory of Abraham Lincoln, to know for ourselves and to prove to the world, that a record made to endure and deep graven on the acres, that the love of country and of its nobly useful citizens are not dreams, nor idle words, but indeed living, stirring and breathing feelings.

"Abraham Lincoln is claimed by all humanity and all time as the type of the race best showing forth the best in all men in all conditions of life.

"Our whole country claims him as the son of the whole Union and Illinois says 'he was mine, the man of Illinois. Here on my prairies he ripened into noble manhood and here he made his home.'

"Indiana, too, says: 'He was mine. In my southern hills the little child grew strong and tall.' And each is right and true. But Kentucky says: 'I am his mother. I nursed him at my breast; my baby, born of me. He is mine.' Shall any claim come before the mother?"

Secretary of War Wright paid an eloquent tribute to Lincoln's under-

standing of the people of the south and his sincere desire for peace and speedy reconstruction after the Civil war. He called attention to the fact that Abraham Lincoln and Jefferson Davis were born in the same state.

"In reading the public utterances of Mr. Lincoln during the period of bitter discussion nothing has impressed me more than the singular clearness of his perception that the responsibility for slavery rested on all our people and was a burden which should be borne by all alike," said the secretary.

"There were a temperance of statement, a respect for the opposite point of a moderation in his position which, when the excitement of the time is considered is most extraordinary and must command our admiration.

"He sincerely believed in an indissoluble union. He sincerely believed that slavery was a curse, and a great moral wrong; and in believing thus he was right. He was opposed not only to its extension, but believed that gradual emancipation was a possibility worth striving for; and yet he

(Continued on Eighth Page.)

Roosevelt, On Lincoln

Editor's Note: The following is taken from a speech delivered by the late Theodore Roosevelt at Lincoln's birthplace, Hodgenville, Kentucky, in 1909. It is reprinted from the National Republican:

This rail splitter—this boy who passed his ungainly youth in the dire poverty of the poorest of the frontier folk, whose rise was by weary and painful labor—lived to lead his people through the burning flames of a struggle from which the nation emerged, purified as if by fire, born anew, to a loftier life. After long years of iron effort, and of failure that came more often than victory, he at last rose to the leadership of the republic at the moment when that leadership had become the stupendous world task of the time. He grew to know greatness, but never ease. Success came to him, but never happiness, save that which springs from doing well a painful and vital task. Power was his, but not pleasure. The furrows deepened on his brow, but his eyes were undimmed by either hate or fear. His gaunt shoulders were bowed, but his steel thighs never faltered as he bore for a burden the destinies of his people. His great and tender heart shrank from giving pain; and the task allotted him was to pour out like water the life blood of the young men, and to feel in his every fiber the sorrow of the women. Disaster saddened but never dismayed him. As the red years of war went by they found him ever doing his duty in the present, ever facing the future with fearless front—high of heart, and dauntless of soul. Unbroken by hatred, unshaken by scorn, he worked and suffered for the people. Triumph was his at last; and barely had he tasted it before murder found him, and the kindly, patient, fearless eyes were closed forever.

ESSENTIALLY ALIKE.

As a people, we are, indeed beyond measure fortunate in the characters of the two greatest of our public men, Washington and Lincoln. Widely though they differed in externals—the Virginia landed gentleman and the Kentucky backwoodsman—they were alike in essentials; they were alike in the great qualities which made each able to do service to his nation and to all mankind such as no other man of his generation could or did render. Each had lofty ideals, but each in striving to attain these lofty ideals was guided by the soundest common sense. Each possessed inflexible courage in adversity, and a soul wholly unspoiled by prosperity. Each possessed all the gentler virtues commonly exhibited by good men who lack rugged strength of character. Each possessed, also, all the strong qualities commonly exhibited by those towering masters of mankind who have too often shown themselves devoid of so much as the understanding of the words by which we signify the qualities of duty, of mercy, of devotion to the right, of lofty disinterestedness in battling for the good of others. There have been other men as great, and other men as good; but in all the history of mankind there are no other two great men as good as these, no other two good men as great. Widely though the problems of today differ from the problems set for solution to Washington when he founded this nation, to Lincoln when he saved it and freed the slave, yet the qualities they showed in meeting these problems are exactly the same as those we should show in doing our work today.

Lincoln saw into the future with the prophetic imagination usually vouchsafed only to the poet and the seer. He had in him all the lift toward greatness of the visionary, without any of the visionary's fanaticism or egotism—without any of the visionary's narrow jealousy of the practical man, and inability to strive in practical fashion for the realization of an ideal. He had the practical man's hard common sense and willingness to adopt means to ends; but there was in him none of that morbid growth of mind and soul which binds so many practical men to the higher things of life. No more practical man ever lived than this homely backwoods idealist; but he had nothing in common with those practical men whose consciences are warped until they fail to distinguish between good and evil, fail to understand that strength, ability, shrewdness, whether in the world of business or of politics, only serve to make their possession a more noxious, a more evil, member of the community if they are not guided and controlled by a fine and high moral sense.

LINCOLN NEVER WAVERED.

We of this day must try to solve many social and industrial problems, requiring to an especial degree the combination of indomitable resolution with coolheaded sanity. We can profit by the way in which Lincoln used both these traits as he strove for reform. We can learn much of value from the very attacks which following that course brought upon his head—attacks alike by the extremists of revolution and by the extremists of reaction. He never wavered in devotion to principles, in his love for the Union, and in his abhorrence of slavery. Timid and lukewarm people were always denouncing him because he was too extreme; but as a matter of fact he never went to extremes, he worked step by step; and because of this the extremists hated and denounced him with a fervor which now seems to us fantastic in its deification of the unreal and the impossible. At the very time when one side was holding him up as the apostle of social revolution because he was against slavery, the leading abolitionist denounced him as the "slave hound of Illinois." When he was the second time candidate for President, the majority of his opponents attacked him because of what they termed his extreme radicalism, while a minority threatened to bolt his nomination because he was not radical enough. He had continually to check those who wished to go forward too fast, at the very time that he overrode the opposition of those who wished not to go forward at all. The goal was never dim before his vision; but he picked his way cautiously, without either halt or hurry, as he strode toward it, through such a morass of difficulty that no man of less courage would have attempted it, while it would surely have overwhelmed any man of judgment less serene.

A VALIANT FIGHTER.

Yet perhaps the most wonderful thing of all, and, from the standpoint of the American of today and of the future, the most vitally important, was the most extraordinary way in which Lincoln could fight valiantly against what he deemed wrong, and yet preserve undiminished his love and respect for the brother from whom he differed. In the hour of a triumph that would have turned any weaker man's head, in the heat of a struggle which spurred many a good man to dreadful vindictiveness, he said truthfully that so long as he had been in his office he had never willingly planted a thorn in any man's bosom.

ROOSEVELT ON LINCOLN.

Rising to the full dignity and inspiration of his theme, President Roosevelt gave a verbal depiction of the martyr president of the United States at the Lincoln celebration at Hodgenville, Ky., yesterday, that will rank as a classic for its severity of style, elegance of diction, comprehensive grasp of the subject, perception of constructive effect and rounded climax. In these days of wauling oratory, when the messages of the times are framed in the scratchy sentences of cryptic English, it is worth something to have such an exhibition of address upon the pattern of former standards as was given by the President. In striking contrast to his usual style of exordium Mr. Roosevelt delivered an oration that was singularly free of the hortatory note, while it fairly vibrated with the high-keyed quality of moral inspiration. It is well within the bounds of expectation to predict that this speech will remain the classic utterance of a president who has been unusually prolific in public addresses. The singular felicity of the speech was due as much to the common qualities—admitting many variant factors—between Mr. Lincoln and Mr. Roosevelt as to the fact that the scholar as well as the nation's executive was speaking at Hodgenville.

It is a matter of gratification to the country at large that President Roosevelt so well measured up to an occasion that will remain a landmark in the nation's history. The beginning of a memorial hall at the birthplace of the man who ranks with Washington has brought the country to view in retrospect the past years and to gather up the lessons of a great life and weave them into the fabric of the country's purposes. With rare skill Mr. Roosevelt delineated the early life of Mr. Lincoln, and brought into his sketch the vivid elements that go to make up an exact portraiture. His comprehension of the burdened patriot shows his close study of the factors that make up Lincoln's greatness. His fine tribute to Mr. Lincoln as the man who "grew to know greatness but never ease" will be regarded as an essential part of any future estimates that may be made of the hero of the country's most critical era.

The address fairly scintillated with epigrammatic expressions, with fine concretions of truth. It would be difficult to find anything finer than "The furrows deepened on his brow, but his eyes were undimmed by either hate or fear. His gaunt shoulders were bowed but his steel thews never faltered as he bore for a burden the destinies of a people," or "No more practical man ever lived than this homely backwoods idealist, but he had nothing in common with those practical men whose consciences are warped until they fail to distinguish between good and evil, fail to understand that strength, ability, shrewdness, whether in the world of business or politics, only serve to make their possessor a more noxious, a more evil member of the community if they are not guided and controlled by a fine and high moral sense."

Referring to the clear-sighted and kindly spirit manifested by Mr. Lincoln at all times, the speaker said: "To only the rarest and loftiest spirits is vouchsafed that clear vision which gradually comes to all as the struggle fades into the distance, and wounds are forgotten and peace creeps back to the hearts that were hurt. But to Lincoln was given this su-

preme vision. He did not hate the man from whom he differed. Weakness was as foreign as wickedness to his strong, gentle nature, but his courage was of a quality so high that it needed no bolstering of dark passion." The remarkably sustained style of eulogy followed by Mr. Roosevelt would be regarded as fulsome were it not that the sanction of time has brought every such tribute quite within the range of conservative fact.

The memorials to Lincoln will be many as the years roll on. His is a character that will become universalized by time, and monuments to his service in the cause of humanity will arise in many lauds. It will be one of the most lasting claims of America for consideration to have produced the man so appreciatively portrayed by Mr. Roosevelt.

AN ADDRESS BY THEODORE ROOSEVELT

*In Celebration of the Hundredth Anniversary of the
Birth of Abraham Lincoln*

Hodgenville, Ky., February 12, 1909

Roosevelt House, Feb 12, 1909

WE have met here to celebrate the hundredth anniversary of the birth of one of the two greatest Americans; of one of the two or three greatest men of the nineteenth century; of one of the greatest men in the world's history. This rail splitter, this boy who passed his ungainly youth in the dire poverty of the poorest of the frontier folk, whose rise was by weary and painful labor, lived to lead his people through the burning flames of a struggle from which the Nation emerged purified as by fire, born anew to a loftier life. After long years of iron effort, and of failure that came more often than victory, he at last rose to the leadership of the Republic, at the moment when that leadership had become the stupendous world-task of the time. He grew to know greatness, but never ease. Success came to him, but never happiness, save that which springs from doing well a painful and vital task. Power was his, but not pleasure. The furrows deepened on his brow, but his eyes were undimmed by either hate or fear. His gaunt shoulders were bowed, but his steel thews never faltered as he bore for a burden the destinies of his people. His great and tender heart shrank from giving pain; and the task allotted him was to pour out like water the life-blood of the young men, and to feel in his every fiber the sorrow of the women. Disaster saddened but never dismayed him. As the red years of war went by they found him ever doing his duty in the present, ever facing the future with fearless front, high of heart, and dauntless of soul. Unbroken by hatred, unshaken by scorn, he worked and suffered for the people. Triumph was his at the last; and barely had he tasted it before murder found him, and the kindly, patient, fearless eyes were closed forever.

As a people we are indeed beyond measure fortunate in the characters of the two greatest of our public men, Washington and Lincoln. Widely though they differed in externals, the Virginia landed gentleman and the Kentucky backwoodsman, they were alike in essentials, they were alike in the great qualities which made each able to render service to his Nation and to all mankind such as no other man of his generation could or did render. Each had lofty ideals, but each in striving to attain these lofty ideals was guided by the soundest common sense. Each possessed inflexible courage in adversity, and a soul wholly unspoiled by prosperity. Each possessed all the gentler virtues commonly exhibited by good men who lack rugged strength of character. Each possessed also all the strong qualities commonly exhibited by those towering masters of mankind who have too often shown themselves devoid of so much as the understanding of the words by which we signify the qualities of duty, of mercy, of devotion to the right, of lofty disinterestedness in battling for the good of others. There have been other men as great and other great men as good; but in all the history of mankind there are no other two men as good as these, no other two good men as great. Widely though the problems of today differ from the problems set for solution to Washington when he founded this Nation, to Lincoln when he saved it and freed the slaves, yet the qualities they showed in meeting these problems are exactly the same as those we should show in doing our work today.

Lincoln saw into the future with the prophetic imagination usually vouchsafed only to the poet and the seer. He had in him all the lift toward greatness of the visionary, without any of the visionary's fanaticism or egotism, without any of the visionary's narrow jealousy of the practical man and inability to strive in practical fashion for the realization of an ideal. He had the practical man's hard common sense and willingness to adapt means to ends; but there was in him none of that morbid growth of mind and soul which blinds so many practical men to the higher things of life. No more practical man ever lived than this homely backwoods idealist; but he had nothing in common with those practical men whose consciences are warped until they fail to distinguish between good and evil, fail to understand that strength, ability, shrewdness, whether in the world of business or of politics, only serve to make their possessor a more noxious, a more evil member of the community, if they are not guided and controlled by a fine and high moral sense.

We of this day must try to solve many social and industrial problems, requiring to an especial degree the combination of indomitable resolution with cool-headed sanity. We can profit by the way in which Lincoln used both these traits as he strove for reform. We can learn much of value from the very attacks which following that course brought upon his head, attacks alike by the extremists of revolution and by the extremists of reaction. He never wavered in devotion to his principles, in his love for the Union, and in his abhorrence of slavery. Timid and lukewarm people were always denouncing him because he was too extreme; but as a matter of fact he never went to extremes, he worked step by step; and because of this the extremists hated and

denounced him with a fervor which now seems to us fantastic in its deification of the unreal and the impossible. At the very time when one side was holding him up as the apostle of social revolution because he was against slavery, the leading abolitionist denounced him as the "slave hound of Illinois." When he was the second time candidate for President, the majority of his opponents attacked him because of what they termed his extreme radicalism, while a minority threatened to bolt his nomination because he was not radical enough. He had continually to check those who wished to go forward too fast, at the very time that he overrode the opposition of those who wished not to go forward at all. The goal was never dim before his vision; but he picked his way cautiously, without either halt or hurry, as he strode toward it, through such a morass of difficulty that no man of less courage would have attempted it, while it would surely have overwhelmed any man of judgment less serene.

Yet perhaps the most wonderful thing of all, and, from the standpoint of the America of today and of the future, the most vitally important, was the extraordinary way in which Lincoln could fight valiantly against what he deemed wrong and yet preserve undiminished his love and respect for the brother from whom he differed. In the hour of a triumph that would have turned any weaker man's head, in the heat of a struggle which spurred many a good man to dreadful vindictiveness, he said truthfully that so long as he had been in office he had never willingly planted a thorn in any man's bosom, and besought his supporters to study the incidents of the trial through which they were passing as philosophy from which to learn wisdom and not as wrongs to be avenged; ending with the solemn exhortation that, as the strife was over, all should reunite in a common effort to save their common country.

He lived in the days that were great and terrible, when brother fought against brother for what each sincerely deemed to be the right. In a contest so grim the strong men who alone can carry it through are rarely able to do justice to the deep convictions of those with whom they grapple in mortal strife. At such times men see through a glass darkly; to only the rarest and loftiest spirits is vouchsafed that clear vision which gradually comes to all, even to the lesser, as the struggle fades into distance, and wounds are forgotten, and peace creeps back to the hearts that were hurt. But to Lincoln was given this supreme vision. He did not hate the man from whom he differed. Weakness was as foreign as wickedness to his strong, gentle nature; but his courage was of a quality so high that it needed no bolstering of dark passion. He saw clearly that the same high qualities, the same courage, and willingness for self-sacrifice and devotion to the right as it was given them to see the right, belonged both to the men of the North and to the men of the South. As the years roll by, and as all of us, wherever we dwell, grow to feel an equal pride in the valor and self-devotion, alike of the men who wore the blue and the men who wore the gray, so this whole nation will grow to feel a peculiar sense of pride in the man whose blood was shed for the union of his people and for the freedom of a race; the lover of his country and of all mankind; the mightiest of the mighty men who mastered the mighty days

ROOSEVELT AT HIS BEST

The Patriot 2-13/08
Contemplation of the lifework of a man of purity and greatness of soul powerfully affects any man of thoughtful mind. A striking illustration of this was presented yesterday by President Roosevelt in his address at the birthplace of Lincoln. Practiced as the President is in the use of English and powerful as his language has always been in his state papers and in his miscellaneous writings the beauty of diction and the profoundness of thought in the Lincoln Day speech will come as a surprise to even his ardent admirers.

Mr. Roosevelt's prolixity which has furnished amusement for the humorists of the press for many months is conspicuously lacking in his address at Hodgenville. Packed into his tribute to his great predecessor in the Presidential office is a comprehensive appreciation of the many facets Lincoln's character presents to the strong, white light of imperishable glory. Phrases abound which epitomize the greatness of the man in a manner which is of the very essence of clarity and vigor.

From the achievements of Lincoln the President traces clearly and inevitably the lesson that crowds upon the mind of even the most thoughtless when he says:

No more practical man ever lived than this homely backwoods idealist; but he had nothing in common with those practical men whose consciences are warped until they fail to distinguish between good and evil, fail to understand that strength, ability, shrewdness, whether in the world of business or of politics, only serve to make their possessor a more noxious, a more evil member of the community if they are not guided and controlled by a fine and high moral sense.

This address of President Roosevelt, coming at the culmination of seven years in the White House, may not be a classic tribute to the memory of the man whose life has provoked so many of the finest literary minds of the world to a white heat of creative power but it is unquestionably the highest attainment in words that Mr. Roosevelt has been permitted to reach.

Harper's Weekly, February 27, 1909.

Mr. Roosevelt on Lincoln

So many speeches were made on the one-hundredth anniversary of LINCOLN's birthday that few found their way into print, but of those we have read that of President ROOSEVELT was incomparably the best. Although apparently the surroundings were somewhat dismal, the occasion itself was inspiring, and the President rose to it admirably. Thanks chiefly to the Messrs. COLLIER, the birthplace of the great emancipator is to be suitably marked and the landmarks preserved, and it was in recognition of this patriotic service that President ROOSEVELT made the long, tiring journey

at an inclement season of the year, and delivered an address which has seldom been excelled in direct forcefulness and simplicity of diction. It was natural that there Mr. ROOSEVELT should do his best. He has studied LINCOLN as he has studied no other public character, and has formed conclusions respecting that odd blending of idealism and practicality, which, though faulty in details, are in the main correct. "We of this day," he aptly declared, "must try to solve many social and industrial problems, requiring to an especial degree the combination of indomitable resolution with cool-headed sanity." And in making the effort, he truly added: "We can profit by the way in which LINCOLN used both these traits as he strove for reform. The goal was never dim before his vision; but he picked his way cautiously, without either halt or hurry, as he strode toward it, through such a morass of difficulty that no man of less courage would have attempted it, while it would surely have overwhelmed any man of judgment less serene." In this high key the brief oration was pitched from its beginning to its end, and will, in our judgment, stand out as the most satisfying effort Mr. ROOSEVELT has yet made.

He Fought Hard but Never Hated

Yet perhaps the most wonderful thing of all, and, from the standpoint of the America of to-day and of the future, the most vitally important, was the extraordinary way in which LINCOLN could fight valiantly against what he deemed wrong and yet preserve undiminished his love and respect for the brother from whom he differed.—President ROOSEVELT on LINCOLN.

Wonderful, yes, but not novel. Nor is LINCOLN the greatest example of it. The greatest example is that of that earlier story-telling teacher and leader whose experiences are recorded in the New Testament.

LINCOLN LAUDED AT GRAND RAPIDS

Roosevelt Says Party Must
Show It Is Heir of
Martyr.

FAVORS RECIPROCITY

Senator Bradley, Speaking
of South, Pays Tribute
to Illinoisan.

1911

GRAND RAPIDS, MICH., February 11.—The election of United States senators by direct vote of the people is favored by former President Roosevelt. He believes the constitution should be amended so as to provide for popular election. In a Lincoln Day speech to-night Col. Roosevelt came out squarely in favor of the movement.

"One of the progressive policies upon which I think the great majority of progressives are agreed is that United States senators should be elected by popular vote," said Col. Roosevelt. "The constitution should, in my judgment, be so amended as to provide for this."

Asserting that the present method of electing senators was a "relic" of old times and should be remedied, the colonel also declared himself in favor of abolishing the electoral college in the election of president. He said, while he believed in the selection of senators by direct vote, he did not favor any policy which would take away from the Federal Government "one particle of the control which it now has as regards the election of senators."

Col. Roosevelt came here from New York to be the chief speaker at the Lincoln anniversary celebration of the Lincoln Club. His subject was "Lincoln and Progressive Republicanism." The banquet hall, seating more than 2000 persons, was crowded. The cheering which greeted the former president's appearance in the hall was a continuation of an ovation which began on his arrival in the afternoon, when the crowds greeted him with cries of "Teddy for president in 1912."

Others at the speakers' table to-night were: Hannis Taylor, former United States ambassador to Spain; Senator William O. Bradley of Kentucky, Gov. Chase Osborn of Michigan, Senator William Alder Smith of Michigan, Representatives Julius Kahn of California and Addison G. Proctor, who was a delegate to the Republican National Convention in 1860.

Col. Roosevelt in his address also urged the adoption of the proposed reciprocity treaty with Canada.

Col. Roosevelt said, in part:

In this region of Michigan and the immediate surrounding territory, I am in the birthplace of the Republican party. It is eminently fitting that I should come here and ask the Republican party to be true to the principles which its founders professed. They could only be true to those principles by applying them to the new issues of the present day, instead of applauding the fact that their fathers applied them to the dead issues of a past day.

Party Must Be Progressive.

The Republican party must be progressive; otherwise it has no warrant for existing at all. It must show that it is the heir of Abraham Lincoln, and not the heir of the cotton Whigs who so feared and denounced what they called his radicalism. But it is equally essential to remember Abraham Lincoln's cool and temperate wisdom, as well as his fiery zeal for righteousness.

There can be no real progress unless it is wise progress. In other words, the Republican party must be not only progressive, but sane. Abraham Lincoln won his place in history because he bearded the forces which overthrew the kind of conservatism which was typified by the followers of Buchanan and Fillmore.

But he was able to overthrow these men because he declined to be led aside from the path of healthy progress to follow the extremists of the John Brown and Wendell Phillips type. These two men rendered at times good service. But if Abraham Lincoln had followed in their steps the result would have been death to the nation.

We must not be misled by mere names. As compared to Buchanan and Fillmore, Lincoln was a radical and an extreme progressive. As compared to John Brown and Wendell Phillips, he was a sane conservative, and he was right in both positions.

Bradley Lauds Lincoln.

Senator W. O. Bradley of Kentucky followed Col. Roosevelt. "No man has ever lived," he declared, "whose memory is so much cherished by our people, irrespective of party, as that greatest, best and most distinguished American."

After paying this tribute to Lincoln Mr. Bradley compared the South to-day with what it was before the war, saying:

"The people of the South are no longer supine and listless. With wonderful courage they have transformed that section into a new country, with new aspirations and new purposes. But there is something even better than all this. The coming of the Spanish war quickly proved to the world that the old-time loyalty of the Southern people was not dead. To-day the South is as loyal and as much devoted to the Union as any other section of the country. It no longer entertains ill will for or prejudice against the North and welcomes your people with open arms."

NEW YORK, February 11.—Senator A. B. Cummins of Iowa spoke in advocacy of the Canadian reciprocity agreement before the Union League of Brooklyn to-night. Commenting upon the fact that some curiosity had been expressed as to what his position would be upon the proposed trade arrangement, the senator said it seemed strange to him that after having advocated Canadian reciprocity in every part of the country for ten years, "when most of its present advocates were denouncing it," that his attitude should be in doubt.

"I am for reciprocity with Canada," he said, "but I am not for every trade arrangement that may be proposed under the name of reciprocity, just as I was for the system of protection in 1909, but I was not for the Payne-Aldrich tariff law. I am not one of those who believe that the free admission of agricultural products into the United States from Canada will materially affect our farmers, but I do believe that while we are admitting free the things which the farmers sell, we should also admit free some of the things the farmer buys."

ROOSEVELT ON LINCOLN.

Strenuous as has been life in the white house for Roosevelt, he frankly confesses in a tribute to the war president that no president who has ever sat in the chair has borne the burden that Lincoln bore, or been under the ceaseless strain which he endured. It did not let up by day or by night. "Ever he had to consider problems of the widest importance, ever to run risks of the greatest magnitude," he says, "and ever through and across his plans to meet these great dangers and great responsibilities was shot the woof of an infinite number of small worries and small annoyances. He worked out his great task while unceasingly beset by the need of attending as best he could to a multitude of small tasks. It is a touching thing that the great leader, while thus driven and absorbed, could yet so often turn aside for the moment to do some deed of personal kindness; and it is a fortunate thing for the nation that in addition to doing so well each deed, great or small, he possessed that marvelous gift of expression which enabled him quite unconsciously to choose the very words best fit to commemorate each deed. His Gettysburg speech and his second inaugural are two of the half dozen greatest speeches ever made,—I am tempted to call them the two greatest ever made. They are great in their wisdom, and dignity, and earnestness, and in a loftiness of thought and expression which makes them akin to the utterances of the prophets of the Old Testament."

Abraham Lincoln — the spirit incarnate of those who won victory in the Civil War—was the true representative of this people, not only for his own generation, but for all time, because he was a man among men. A man who embodied the qualities of his fellow-men, but who embodied them to the highest and the most unusual degree of perfection, who embodied all that there was in the nation of courage, of wisdom, of gentle, patient kindness, and of common sense.—*Theodore Roosevelt.*

LEADING MEN'S TRIBUTES TO LINCOLN

From Speeches Made at the Lincoln Day Celebrations.

"As the years roll by, and as all of us, wherever we dwell, grow to feel an equal pride in the valor and self-devotion alike of the men who wore the blue and the men who wore the gray, so this whole nation will grow to feel a peculiar sense of pride in the man whose blood was shed for the union of his people and for the freedom of a race; the lover of his country and of all mankind, the mightiest of the mighty men who mastered the mighty days, Abraham Lincoln."

THEODORE ROOSEVELT.

"The eloquence of Demosthenes and Cicero were no more necessary to their work, and Lincoln deserves to have his name written on the scroll with theirs."

WM. J. BRYAN.

"In revering the name of Lincoln there is now no North or South, nor East or West. There is but one heart in all and that heart the heart of patriotic America."

JOSEPH W. FOLK.

"To Lincoln more than to any other man we owe, and shall for all time owe, the joy, the power and the gift of grace of a mighty people joined together as they never were before under one flag and one covenant of the law."

GOVERNOR WILLSON, OF KENTUCKY.

"America had a Washington when a Washington was needed and a Lincoln when a Lincoln could save them."

M. JULES JUSSERAND.

"It was Lincoln's dauntless courage and his clear thinking that fitted him to be the pilot who brought your ship through the wildest tempest that ever broke upon her."

AMBASSADOR JAMES BRYCE.

"Lincoln was like some great instrument of humanify. Wherever life touched him he spoke back its meaning, gave forth fire to kindle its life."

WOODROW WILSON.

"The South can and does without bitterness and in all sincerity join with all the people of this nation and all the people of all nations in paying tribute to Abraham Lincoln, the liberator, the pacificator, the great American."

GEN. LUKE E. WRIGHT.

CONGER

T. Roosevelt's Cairo, Ill., Speech

128. President Theodore Roosevelt, manuscript corrected galley proof, 13 pages, 8½x21 inches, Oct. 3, 1907, addressed to "Men of Illinois, and You, Men of Kentucky and Missouri."

No newsman was safe in relying on Roosevelt's advance press releases. T. R. had a habit of inserting passages in pen or pencil up to the moment of delivery. On the second page of this speech, T. R. has added in ink: "This was the region that brought forth mighty Abraham Lincoln, the incarnation of all that is best in democratic life; and from the loins of the same people, living only a little farther south, sprang another of our greatest Presidents, Andrew Jackson, "Old Hickory"—a man who made mistakes, like most strong men, but a man of iron will and incorruptible integrity, fearless, upright, devoted to the welfare of his countrymen, bone of our bone, flesh of our flesh, a typical American if ever there was one."

Again on pages four and nine, he adds nearly a paragraph to each, strengthening his plea for social reform. Those collectors who heard and saw the dynamic Teddy on the stump can, from this speech, recapture some of the old thrill his words and gestures caused long ago. And the words he spoke on social reform at Cairo over thirty years ago, are still good, sound sense! *Search # 52* \$125

62D CONGRESS }
2d Session }

SENATE

5-1209
{ DOCUMENT
No. 348 }

A CHARTER OF DEMOCRACY

ADDRESS

OF

HON. THEODORE ROOSEVELT

EX-PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

BEFORE THE

OHIO CONSTITUTIONAL CONVENTION

FEBRUARY 21, 1912



PRESENTED BY MR. CLAPP
FEBRUARY 26, 1912.—Ordered to be printed.

WASHINGTON
1912



A CHARTER OF DEMOCRACY.

By THEODORE ROOSEVELT.

MR. PRESIDENT, AND MEMBERS OF THE OHIO CONSTITUTIONAL CONVENTION :
I am profoundly sensible of the honor you have done me in asking me to address you. You are engaged in the fundamental work of self-government; you are engaged in framing a constitution under and in accordance with which the people are to get and to do justice and absolutely to rule themselves. No representative body can have a higher task. To carry it through successfully there is need to combine practical common sense of the most hard-headed kind with a spirit of lofty idealism. Without idealism your work will be but a sordid makeshift; and without the hard-headed common sense the idealism will be either wasted or worse than wasted.

I shall not try to speak to you of matters of detail. Each of our Commonwealths has its own local needs, local customs, and habits of thought, different from those of other Commonwealths; and each must therefore apply in its own fashion the great principles of our political life. But these principles themselves are in their essence applicable everywhere, and of some of them I shall speak to you. I can not touch upon them all; the subject is too vast and the time too limited: if any one of you cares to know my views of these matters which I do not to-day discuss, I will gladly send him a copy of the speeches I made in 1910, which I think cover most of the ground.

I believe in pure democracy. With Lincoln, I hold that "this country, with its institutions, belongs to the people who inhabit it. Whenever they shall grow weary of the existing government, they can exercise their constitutional right of amending it." We Progressives believe that the people have the right, the power, and the duty to protect themselves and their own welfare; that human rights are supreme over all other rights; that wealth should be the servant, not the master, of the people. We believe that unless representative government does absolutely represent the people it is not representative government at all. We test the worth of all men and all measures by asking how they contribute to the welfare of the men, women, and children of whom this Nation is composed. We are engaged in one of the great battles of the age-long contest waged against privilege on behalf of the common welfare. We hold it a prime duty of the people to free our Government from the control of money in politics. For this purpose we advocate, not as ends in themselves, but as weapons in the hands of the people, all governmental devices which will make the representatives of the people more easily and certainly responsible to the people's will.

This country, as Lincoln said, belongs to the people. So do the natural resources which make it rich. They supply the basis of our prosperity now and hereafter. In preserving them, which is a national duty, we must not forget that monopoly is based on the control of natural resources and natural advantages, and that it will help the people little to conserve our natural wealth unless the benefits which it can yield are secured to the people. Let us remember, also, that conservation does not stop with the natural resources, but that the principle of making the best use of all we have requires with equal or greater insistence that we shall stop the waste of human life in industry and prevent the waste of human welfare which flows from the unfair use of concentrated power and wealth in the hands of men whose eagerness for profit blinds them to the cost of what they do. We have no higher duty than to promote the efficiency of the individual. There is no surer road to the efficiency of the Nation.

I am emphatically a believer in constitutionalism, and because of this fact I no less emphatically protest against any theory that would make of the Consti-

tution a means of thwarting instead of securing the absolute right of the people to rule themselves and to provide for their own social and industrial well-being. All constitutions, those of the States no less than that of the Nation, are designed, and must be interpreted and administered, so as to fit human rights. Lincoln so interpreted and administered the National Constitution. Buchanan attempted the reverse, attempted to fit human rights to, and limit them by, the Constitution. It was Buchanan who treated the courts as a fetish, who protested against and condemned all criticism of the judges for unjust and unrighteous decisions, and upheld the Constitution as an instrument for the protection of privilege and of vested wrong. It was Lincoln who appealed to the people against the judges when the judges went wrong, who advocated and secured what was practically the recall of the Dred Scott decision, and who treated the Constitution as a living force for righteousness. We stand for applying the Constitution to the issues of to-day as Lincoln applied it to the issues of his day; Lincoln, mind you, and not Buchanan, was the real upholder and preserver of the Constitution, for the true progressive, the progressive of the Lincoln stamp, is the only true constitutionalist, the only real conservative. The object of every American constitution worth calling such must be what it is set forth to be in the preamble to the National Constitution, "to establish justice"; that is, to secure justice as between man and man by means of genuine popular self-government. If the Constitution is successfully invoked to nullify the effort to remedy injustice, it is proof positive either that the Constitution needs immediate amendment or else that it is being wrongfully and improperly construed. I therefore very earnestly ask you clearly to provide in this Constitution means which will enable the people readily to amend it if at any point it works injustice, and also means which will permit the people themselves by popular vote, after due deliberation and discussion, but finally and without appeal, to settle what the proper construction of any constitutional point is. It is often said that ours is a Government of checks and balances. But this should only mean that these checks and balances obtain as among the several different kinds of representatives of the people—judicial, executive, and legislative—to whom the people have delegated certain portions of their power. It does not mean that the people have parted with their power or can not resume it. The "division of powers" is merely the division among the representatives of the powers delegated to them; the term must not be held to mean that the people have divided their power with their delegates. The power is the people's, and only the people's. It is right and proper that provision should be made rendering it necessary for the people to take ample time to make up their minds on any point; but there should also be complete provision to have their decision put into immediate and living effect when it has thus been deliberately and definitely reached.

I hold it to be the duty of every public servant, and of every man who in public or in private life holds a position of leadership in thought or action, to endeavor honestly and fearlessly to guide his fellow-countrymen to right decisions; but I emphatically dissent from the view that it is either wise or necessary to try to devise methods which under the Constitution will automatically prevent the people from deciding for themselves what governmental action they deem just and proper. It is impossible to invent constitutional devices which will prevent the popular will from being effective for wrong without also preventing it from being effective for right. The only safe course to follow in this great American democracy is to provide for making the popular judgment really effective. When this is done, then it is our duty to see that the people, having the full power, realize their heavy responsibility for exercising that power aright. But it is a false constitutionalism, a false statesmanship, to endeavor by the exercise of a perverted ingenuity to seem to give the people full power and at the same time to trick them out of it. Yet this is precisely what is done in every case where the State permits its representatives, whether on the bench or in the legislature or in executive office, to declare that it has not the power to right grave social wrongs, or that any of the officers created by the people, and rightfully the servants of the people, can set themselves up to be the masters of the people. Constitution makers should make it clear beyond shadow of doubt that the people in their legislative capacity have the power to enact into law any measure they deem necessary for the betterment of social and industrial conditions. The wisdom of framing any particular law of this kind is a proper subject of debate; but the power of the people to enact the law should not be subject to debate. To hold the contrary view is to be false to the cause of the people, to the cause of American democracy.

Lincoln, with his clear vision, his ingrained sense of justice, and his spirit of kindly friendliness to all, forecast our present struggle and saw the way out. What he said should be pondered by capitalist and workingman alike. He spoke as follows (I condense):

"I hold that while man exists it is his duty to improve not only his condition but to assist in ameliorating mankind. Labor is prior to and independent of capital. Labor is the superior of capital, and deserves much the higher consideration. Capital has its rights, which are as worthy of protection as any other rights. Nor should this lead to a war upon property. Property is the fruit of labor. Property is desirable, is a positive good in the world. Let not him who is houseless pull down the house of another, but let him work diligently and build one for himself, thus by example assuring that his own shall be safe from violence when built."

This last sentence characteristically shows Lincoln's homely, kindly common sense. His is the attitude that we ought to take. He showed the proper sense of proportion in his relative estimates of capital and labor, of human rights and the rights of wealth. Above all; in what he thus said, as on so many other occasions, he taught the indispensable lesson of the need of wise kindness and charity, of sanity and moderation, in the dealings of men one with another.

We should discriminate between two purposes we have in view. The first is the effort to provide what are themselves the ends of good government; the second is the effort to provide proper machinery for the achievement of these ends.

The ends of good government in our democracy are to secure by genuine popular rule a high average of moral and material well-being among our citizens. It has been well said that in the past we have paid attention only to the accumulation of prosperity, and that from henceforth we must pay equal attention to the proper distribution of prosperity. This is true. The only prosperity worth having is that which affects the mass of the people. We are bound to strive for the fair distribution of prosperity. But it behooves us to remember that there is no use in devising methods for the proper distribution of prosperity unless the prosperity is there to distribute. I hold it to be our duty to see that the wageworker, the small producer, the ordinary consumer, shall get their fair share of the benefit of business prosperity. But it either is or ought to be evident to every one that business has to prosper before anybody can get any benefit from it. Therefore I hold that he is the real progressive, that he is the genuine champion of the people, who endeavors to shape the policy alike of the Nation and of the several States so as to encourage legitimate and honest business at the same time that he wars against all crookedness and injustice and unfairness and tyranny in the business world (for of course we can only get business put on a basis of permanent prosperity when the element of injustice is taken out of it). This is the reason why I have for so many years insisted, as regards our National Government, that it is both futile and mischievous to endeavor to correct the evils of big business by an attempt to restore business conditions as they were in the middle of the last century, before railways and telegraphs had rendered larger business organizations both inevitable and desirable. The effort to restore such conditions, and to trust for justice solely to such proposed restoration, is as foolish as if we should attempt to arm our troops with the flintlocks of Washington's Continentals instead of with modern weapons of precision. Flintlock legislation, of the kind that seeks to prohibit all combinations, good or bad, is bound to fail, and the effort, in so far as it accomplishes anything at all, merely means that some of the worst combinations are not checked, and that honest business is checked.

What is needed is, first, the recognition that modern business conditions have come to stay, in so far at least as these conditions mean that business must be done in larger units, and then the cool-headed and resolute determination to introduce an effective method of regulating big corporations so as to help legitimate business as an incident to thoroughly and completely safeguard the interests of the people as a whole. We are a business people. The tillers of the soil, the wageworkers, the business men—these are the three big and vitally important divisions of our population. The welfare of each division is vitally necessary to the welfare of the people as a whole. The great mass of business is of course done by men whose business is either small or of moderate size. The middle-sized business men form an element of strength which is of literally incalculable value to the Nation. Taken as a class, they are among our best citizens. They have not been seekers after enormous fortunes; they have been

moderately and justly prosperous, by reason of dealing fairly with their customers, competitors, and employees. They are satisfied with a legitimate profit that will pay their expenses of living and lay by something for those who come after, and the additional amount necessary for the betterment and improvement of their plant. The average business man of this type is, as a rule, a leading citizen of his community, foremost in everything that tells for its betterment, a man whom his neighbors look up to and respect; he is in no sense dangerous to his community, just because he is an integral part of his community, bone of its bone and flesh of its flesh. His life fibers are intertwined with the life fibers of his fellow citizens. Yet nowadays many men of this kind, when they come to make necessary trade agreements with one another, find themselves in danger of becoming unwitting transgressors of the law, and are at a loss to know what the law forbids and what it permits. This is all wrong. There should be a fixed governmental policy, a policy which shall clearly define and punish wrongdoing, and shall give in advance full information to any man as to just what he can and just what he can not legally and properly do. It is absurd and wicked to treat the deliberate lawbreaker as on an exact par with the man eager to obey the law, whose only desire is to find out from some competent governmental authority what the law is and then live up to it. It is absurd to endeavor to regulate business in the interest of the public by means of long-drawn lawsuits without any accompaniment of administrative control and regulation, and without any attempt to discriminate between the honest man who has succeeded in business because of rendering a service to the public and the dishonest man who has succeeded in business by cheating the public.

So much for the small business man and the middle-sized business man. Now for big business. It is imperative to exercise over big business a control and supervision which is unnecessary as regards small business. All business must be conducted under the law, and all business men, big or little, must act justly. But a wicked big interest is necessarily more dangerous to the community than a wicked little interest. "Big business" in the past has been responsible for much of the special privilege which must be unsparingly cut out of our national life. I do not believe in making mere size of and by itself criminal. The mere fact of size, however, does unquestionably carry the potentiality of such grave wrongdoing that there should be by law provision made for the strict supervision and regulation of these great industrial concerns doing an interstate business, much as we now regulate the transportation agencies which are engaged in interstate business. The antitrust law does good in so far as it can be invoked against combinations which really are monopolies or which restrict production or which artificially raise prices. But in so far as its workings are uncertain, or as it threatens corporations which have not been guilty of antisocial conduct, it does harm. Moreover, it can not by itself accomplish more than a trifling part of the governmental regulation of big business which is needed. The Nation and the States must cooperate in this matter. Among the States that have entered this field Wisconsin has taken a leading place. Following Senator La Follette, a number of practical workers and thinkers in Wisconsin have turned that State into an experimental laboratory of wise governmental action in aid of social and industrial justice. They have initiated the kind of progressive government which means not merely the preservation of true democracy, but the extension of the principle of true democracy into industrialism as well as into politics. One prime reason why the State has been so successful in this policy lies in the fact that it has done justice to corporations precisely as it has exacted justice from them. Its public utilities commission in a recent report answered certain critics as follows:

"To be generous to the people of the State at the expense of justice to the carriers would be a species of official brigandage that ought to hold the perpetrators up to the execration of all honest men. Indeed, we have no idea that the people of Wisconsin have the remotest desire to deprive the railroads of the State of aught that, in equality and good conscience, belongs to them, and if any of them have, their wishes can not be gratified by this commission."

This is precisely the attitude we should take toward big business. It is the practical application of the principle of the square deal. Not only as a matter of justice, but in our own interest, we should scrupulously respect the rights of honest and decent business and should encourage it where its activities make, as they do make, for the common good. It is for the advantage of all of us when business prospers. It is for the advantage of all of us to have the United States become the leading nation in international trade, and we should not deprive this Nation, we should not deprive this people of the instruments best

adapted to secure such international commercial supremacy. In other words, our demand is that big business give the people a square deal and that the people give a square deal to any man engaged in big business who honestly endeavors to do what is right and proper.

On the other hand, any corporation, big or little, which has gained its position by unfair methods and by interference with the rights of others, which has raised prices or limited output in improper fashion and been guilty of demoralizing and corrupt practices, should not only be broken up, but it should be made the business of some competent governmental body, by constant supervision, to see that it does not come together again, save under such strict control as to insure the community against all danger of a repetition of the bad conduct. The chief trouble with big business has arisen from the fact that big business has so often refused to abide by the principle of the square deal; the opposition which I personally have encountered from big business has in every case arisen not because I did not give a square deal but because I did.

All business into which the element of monopoly in any way or degree enters, and where it proves in practice impossible totally to eliminate this element of monopoly, should be carefully supervised, regulated, and controlled by governmental authority; and such control should be exercised by administrative, rather than by judicial officers. No effort should be made to destroy a big corporation merely because it is big, merely because it has shown itself a peculiarly efficient business instrument. But we should not fear, if necessary, to bring the regulation of big corporations to the point of controlling conditions so that the wage-worker shall have a wage more than sufficient to cover the bare cost of living, and hours of labor not so excessive as to wreck his strength by the strain of unending toil and leave him unfit to do his duty as a good citizen in the community. Where regulation by competition (which is, of course, preferable) proves insufficient, we should not shrink from bringing governmental regulation to the point of control of monopoly prices, if it should ever become necessary to do so, just as in exceptional cases railway rates are now regulated.

In emphasizing the part of the administrative department in regulating combinations and checking absolute monopoly, I do not, of course, overlook the obvious fact that the legislature and the judiciary must do their part. The legislature should make it more clear exactly what methods are illegal, and then the judiciary will be in a better position to punish adequately and relentlessly those who insist on defying the clear legislative decrees. I do not believe any absolute private monopoly is justified, but if our great combinations are properly supervised, so that immoral practices are prevented, absolute monopoly will not come to pass, as the laws of competition and efficiency are against it.

The important thing is this, that under such Government recognition as we may give to that which is beneficent and wholesome in large business organizations we shall be most vigilant never to allow them to crystallize into a condition which shall make private initiative difficult. It is of the utmost importance that in the future we shall keep the broad path of opportunity just as open and easy for our children as it was for our fathers during the period which has been the glory of America's industrial history; that it shall be not only possible but easy for an ambitious man, whose character has so impressed itself upon his neighbors that they are willing to give him capital and credit to start in business for himself, and, if his superior efficiency deserves it, to triumph over the biggest organization that may happen to exist in his particular field. Whatever practices upon the part of large combinations may threaten to discourage such a man or deny to him that which in the judgment of the community is a square deal should be specially defined by the statutes as crimes; and in every case the individual corporation officer responsible for such unfair dealing should be punished.

We grudge no man a fortune which represents his own power and sagacity exercised with entire regard to the welfare of his fellows. We have only praise for the business man whose business success comes as an incident to doing good work for his fellows; but we should so shape conditions that a fortune shall be obtained only in honorable fashion, in such fashion that its gaining represents benefit to the community.

In a word, then, our fundamental purpose must be to secure genuine equality of opportunity. No man should receive a dollar unless that dollar has been fairly earned. Every dollar received should represent a dollar's worth of service rendered. No watering of stocks should be permitted; and it can be prevented only by close governmental supervision of all stock issues so as to prevent overcapitalization.

We stand for the rights of property, but we stand even more for the rights of man. We will protect the rights of the wealthy man, we maintain that he holds his wealth subject to the general right of the community to regulate its business use as the public welfare requires.

We also maintain that the Nation and the several States have the right to regulate the terms and conditions of labor, which is the chief element of wealth, directly in the interest of the common good. It is our prime duty to shape the industrial and social forces so that they may tell for the material and moral upbuilding of the farmer and the wageworker, just as they should do in the case of the business man. You framers of this constitution be careful so to frame it that under it the people shall leave themselves free to do whatever is necessary in order to help the farmers of the State to get for themselves and their wives and children not only the benefits of better farming but also those of better business methods and better conditions of life on the farm.

Moreover, shape your constitutional action so that the people will be able through their legislative bodies, or, failing that, by direct popular vote, to provide workmen's compensation acts, to regulate the hours of labor for children and for women, to provide for their safety while at work, and to prevent over-work or work under unhygienic or unsafe conditions. See to it that no restrictions are placed upon legislative powers that will prevent the enactment of laws under which your people can promote the general welfare, the common good. Thus only will the "general welfare" clause of our constitution become a vital force for progress, instead of remaining a mere phrase. This also applies to the police powers of the Government. Make it perfectly clear that on every point of this kind it is your intention that the people shall decide for themselves how far the laws to achieve their purposes shall go, and that their decision shall be binding upon every citizen in the State, official or nonofficial, unless, of course, the Supreme Court of the Nation in any given case decides otherwise.

So much for the ends of government; and I have, of course, merely sketched in outline what the ends should be. Now for the machinery by which these ends are to be achieved; and here again, remember, I only sketch in outline and do not for a moment pretend to work out in detail the methods of achieving your purposes. Let me at the outset urge upon you to remember that, while machinery is important, it is easy to overestimate its importance; and, moreover, that each community has the absolute right to determine for itself what that machinery shall be, subject only to the fundamental law of the Nation as expressed in the Constitution of the United States. Massachusetts has the right to have appointive judges who serve during good behavior, subject to removal, not by impeachment, but by simple majority vote of the two houses of the legislature whenever the representatives of the people feel that the needs of the people require such removal. New York has the right to have a long-term elective judiciary. Ohio has the right to have a short-term elective judiciary without the recall. California, Oregon, and Arizona have each and every one of them the right to have a short-term elective judiciary with the recall. Personally, of the four systems I prefer the Massachusetts one, if addition be made to it as I hereinafter indicate; but that is merely my preference; and neither I nor any one else within or without public life has the right to impose his preference upon any community when the question is as to how that community chooses to arrange for its executive, legislative, or judicial functions. But as you have invited me to address you here, I will give you my views as to the kind of governmental machinery which at this time and under existing social and industrial conditions it seem to me that, as a people, we need.

In the first place, I believe in the short ballot. You can not get good service from the public servant if you can not see him, and there is no more effective way of hiding him than by mixing him up with a multitude of others so that they are none of them important enough to catch the eye of the average, workaday citizen. The crook in public life is not ordinarily the man whom the people themselves elect directly to a highly important and responsible position. The type of boss who has made the name of politician odious rarely himself runs for high elective office; and if he does and is elected, the people have only themselves to blame. The professional politician and the professional lobbyist thrive most rankly under a system which provides a multitude of elective officers, of such divided responsibility and of such obscurity that the public knows, and can know, but little as to their duties and the way they perform

them. The people have nothing whatever to fear from giving any public servant power so long as they retain their own power to hold him accountable for his use of the power they have delegated to him. You will get best service where you elect only a few men, and where each man has his definite duties and responsibilities, and is obliged to work in the open, so that the people know who he is and what he is doing, and have the information that will enable them to hold him to account for his stewardship.

I believe in providing for direct nominations by the people, including therein direct preferential primaries for the election of delegates to the national nominating conventions. Not as a matter of theory, but as a matter of plain and proved experience, we find that the convention system, while it often records the popular will, is also often used by adroit politicians as a method of thwarting the popular will. In other words, the existing machinery for nominations is cumbersome, and is not designed to secure the real expression of the popular desire. Now, as good citizens we are all of us willing to acquiesce cheerfully in a nomination secured by the expression of a majority of the people, but we do not like to acquiesce in a nomination secured by adroit political management in defeating the wish of the majority of the people.

I believe in the election of United States Senators by direct vote. Just as actual experience convinced our people that Presidents should be elected (as they now are in practice, although not in theory) by direct vote of the people instead of by indirect vote through an untrammelled electoral college, so actual experience has convinced us that Senators should be elected by direct vote of the people instead of indirectly through the various legislatures.

I believe in the initiative and the referendum, which should be used not to destroy representative government, but to correct it whenever it becomes misrepresentative. Here, again, I am concerned not with theories but with actual facts. If in any State the people are themselves satisfied with their present representative system, then it is of course their right to keep that system unchanged; and it is nobody's business but theirs. But in actual practice it has been found in very many States that legislative bodies have not been responsive to the popular will. Therefore I believe that the State should provide for the possibility of direct popular action in order to make good such legislative failure. The power to invoke such direct action, both by initiative and by referendum, should be provided in such fashion as to prevent its being wantonly or too frequently used. I do not believe that it should be made the easy or ordinary way of taking action. In the great majority of cases it is far better that action on legislative matters should be taken by those specially delegated to perform the task; in other words, that the work should be done by the experts chosen to perform it. But where the men thus delegated fail to perform their duty, then it should be in the power of the people themselves to perform the duty. In a recent speech Gov. McGovern, of Wisconsin, has described the plan which has been there adopted. Under this plan the effort to obtain the law is first to be made through the legislature, the bill being pushed as far as it will go; so that the details of the proposed measure may be thrashed over in actual legislative debate. This gives opportunity to perfect it in form and invites public scrutiny. Then, if the legislature fails to enact it, it can be enacted by the people on their own initiative, taken at least four months before election. Moreover, where possible, the question actually to be voted on by the people should be made as simple as possible.

In short, I believe that the initiative and referendum should be used, not as substitutes for representative government, but as methods of making such government really representative. Action by the initiative or referendum ought not to be the normal way of legislation; but the power to take it should be provided in the constitution, so that if the representatives fail truly to represent the people on some matter of sufficient importance to rouse popular interest, then the people shall have in their hands the facilities to make good the failure. And I urge you not to try to put constitutional fetters on the legislature, as so many constitution makers have recently done. Such action on your part would invite the courts to render nugatory every legislative act to better social conditions. Give the legislature an entirely free hand; and then provide by the initiative and referendum that the people shall have power to reverse or supplement the work of the legislature should it ever become necessary.

As to the recall, I do not believe that there is any great necessity for it as regards short-term elective officers. On abstract grounds I was originally inclined to be hostile to it. I know of one case where it was actually used with mischievous results. On the other hand, in three cases in municipalities

on the Pacific coast which have come to my knowledge it was used with excellent results. I believe it should be generally provided, but with such restrictions as will make it available only when there is a widespread and genuine public feeling among a majority of the voters.

There remains the question of the recall of judges. One of the ablest jurists in the United States, a veteran in service to the people, recently wrote me as follows on this subject:

"There are two causes of the agitation for the recall as applied to judges. First, the administration of justice has withdrawn from life and become artificial and technical. The recall is not so much a recall of judges from office as it is a recall of the administration of justice back to life, so that it shall become, as it ought to be, the most efficient of all agencies for making this earth a better place to live in. Judges have set their rules above life. Like the Pharisees of old, they have said, 'The people be accursed, they know not the law' (that is our 'rule'). Courts have repeatedly defended the aroused moral sentiment of a whole Commonwealth. Take the example of the St. Louis boddlers. Their guilt was plain, and in the main confessed. The whole State was aroused and outraged. By an instinct that goes to the very foundation of all social order they demanded that the guilty be punished. The boddlers were convicted, but the Supreme Court of Missouri, never questioning their guilt, set their conviction aside upon purely technical grounds. The same thing occurred in California. Nero, fiddling over burning Rome, was a patriot and a statesman in comparison with judges who thus trifle with and frustrate the aroused moral sentiment of a great people, for that sentiment is politically the vital breath of both State and Nation. It is to recall the administration of justice back from such practices that the recent agitation has arisen.

"Second, by the abuse of the power to declare laws unconstitutional the courts have become a lawmaking instead of a law-enforcing agency. Here, again, the settled will of society to correct confessed evils has been set at naught by those who place metaphysics above life. It is the courts, not the constitutions, that are at fault. It is only by the process which James Russell Lowell, when answering the critics of Lincoln, called 'pettifogging the constitution' that constitutions which were designed to protect society can thus be made to defeat the common good. Here, again, the recall is a recall of the administration of justice back from academical refinements to social service."

An independent and upright judiciary which fearlessly stands for the right, even against popular clamor, but which also understands and sympathizes with popular needs, is a great asset of popular government. There is no public servant and no private man whom I place above a judge of the best type, and very few whom I rank beside him. I believe in the cumulative value of the law and in its value as an impersonal, disinterested basis of control. I believe in the necessity for the courts' interpretation of the law as law without the power to change the law or to substitute some other thing than law for it. But I agree with every great jurist, from Marshall downward, when I say that every judge is bound to consider two separate elements in his decision of a case, one the terms of the law, and the other the conditions of actual life to which the law is to be applied. Only by taking both of these elements into account is it possible to apply the law as its spirit and intent demand that it be applied. Both law and life are to be considered in order that the law and the constitution shall become, in John Marshall's word, "a living instrument and not a dead letter." Justice between man and man, between the State and its citizens, is a living thing, whereas legalistic justice is a dead thing. Moreover, never forget that the judge is just as much the servant of the people as any other official. Of course, he must act conscientiously. So must every other official. He must not do anything wrong because there is popular clamor for it any more than under similar circumstances a governor or a legislator or a public utilities commissioner should do wrong. Each must follow his conscience, even though to do so costs him his place. But in their turn the people must follow their conscience, and when they have definitely decided on a given policy they must have public servants who will carry out that policy.

Keep clearly in mind the distinction between the end and the means to attain that end. Our aim is to get the type of judge that I have described, to keep him on the bench as long as possible, and to keep off the bench and, if necessary, take off the bench the wrong type of judge. In some communities one method may work well which in other communities does not work well, and each community should adopt and preserve or reject a given method according to its practical working. Therefore the question of applying the recall in any

shape is one of expediency merely. Each community has a right to try the experiment for itself in whatever shape it pleases. Under the conditions set forth in the extract from the letter given above, I would personally have favored the recall of the judges both in California and in Missouri; for no damage that could have been done by the recall would have equalled the damage done to the community by judges whose conduct had revolted not only the spirit of justice, but the spirit of common sense. I do not believe in adopting the recall save as a last resort, when it has become clearly evident that no other course will achieve the desired result. But either the recall will have to be adopted or else it will have to be made much easier than it now is to get rid, not merely of a bad judge, but of a judge who, however virtuous, has grown so out of touch with social needs and facts that he is unfit longer to render good service on the bench. It is nonsense to say that impeachment meets the difficulty. In actual practice we have found that impeachment does not work, that unfit judges stay on the bench in spite of it, and indeed because of the fact that impeachment is the only remedy that can be used against them. Where such is the actual fact it is idle to discuss the theory of the case. Impeachment as a remedy for the ills of which the people justly complain is a complete failure. A quicker, a more summary, remedy is needed; some remedy at least as summary and as drastic as that embodied in the Massachusetts constitution. And whenever it be found in actual practice that such remedy does not give the needed results, I would unhesitatingly adopt the recall.

But there is one kind of recall in which I very earnestly believe, and the immediate adoption of which I urge. There are sound reasons for being cautious about the recall of a good judge who has rendered an unwise and improper decision. Every public servant, no matter how valuable, and not omitting Washington or Lincoln or Marshall at times makes mistakes. Therefore we should be cautious about recalling the judge, and we should be cautious about interfering in any way with the judge in decisions which he makes in the ordinary course as between individuals. But when a judge decides a constitutional question, when he decides what the people as a whole can or can not do, the people should have the right to recall that decision if they think it wrong. We should hold the judiciary in all respect; but it is both absurd and degrading to make a fetish of a judge or of anyone else. Abraham Lincoln said, in his first inaugural:

"If the policy of the Government upon vital questions affecting the whole people is to be irrevocably fixed by decisions of the Supreme Court, * * * the people will have ceased to be their own rulers, having to that extent practically resigned their government into the hands of that eminent tribunal. Nor is there in this view any assault upon the courts or the judges."

Lincoln actually applied in successful fashion the principle of the recall in the Dred Scott case. He denounced the Supreme Court for that iniquitous decision in language much stronger than I have ever used in criticizing any court, and appealed to the people to recall the decision—the word "recall" in this connection was not then known, but the phrase exactly describes what he advocated. He was successful, the people took his view, and the decision was practically recalled. It became a dead letter without the need of any constitutional amendment. In any contest to-day where the people stand for justice and the courts do not, the man who supports the courts against the people is untrue to the memory of Lincoln and shows that he is the spiritual heir, not of the men who followed and supported Lincoln, but of the Cotton Whigs who supported Chief Justice Taney and denounced Lincoln for attacking the courts and the Constitution.

Under our Federal system the remedy for a wrong such as Abraham Lincoln described is difficult. But the remedy is not difficult in a State. What the Supreme Court of the Nation decides to be law binds both the National and the State courts and all the people within the boundaries of the Nation. But the decision of a State court on a constitutional question should be subject to revision by the people of the State. Again and again in the past justice has been scandalously obstructed by State courts declaring State laws in conflict with the Federal Constitution, although the Supreme Court of the Nation had never so decided or had even decided in a contrary sense. When the supreme court of the State declares a given statute unconstitutional, because in conflict with the State or the National Constitution, its opinion should be subject to revision by the people themselves. Such an opinion ought always to be treated with great respect by the people, and unquestionably in the majority of cases would be accepted and followed by them. But actual experience has shown

the vital need of the people reserving to themselves the right to pass upon such opinion. If any considerable number of the people feel that the decision is in defiance of justice, they should be given the right by petition to bring before the voters at some subsequent election, special or otherwise, as might be decided, and after the fullest opportunity for deliberation and debate, the question whether or not the judges' interpretation of the Constitution is to be sustained. If it is sustained, well and good. If not, then the popular verdict is to be accepted as final, the decision is to be treated as reversed, and the construction of the Constitution definitely decided—subject only to action by the Supreme Court of the United States.

Many eminent lawyers who more or less frankly disbelieve in our entire American system of government for, by, and of the people, violently antagonize this proposal. They believe, and sometimes assert, that the American people are not fitted for popular government, and that it is necessary to keep the judiciary "independent of the majority or of all the people;" that there must be no appeal to the people from the decision of a court in any case; and that therefore the judges are to be established as sovereign rulers over the people. I take absolute issue with all those who hold such a position. I regard it as a complete negation of our whole system of government; and if it became the dominant position in this country, it would mean the absolute upsetting of both the rights and the rule of the people. If the American people are not fit for popular government, and if they should of right be the servants and not the masters of the men whom they themselves put in office, then Lincoln's work was wasted and the whole system of government upon which this great democratic republic rests is a failure. I believe, on the contrary, with all my heart that the American people are fit for complete self-government, and that, in spite of all our failings and shortcomings, we of this Republic have more nearly realized than any other people on earth the ideal of justice attained through genuine popular rule. The position which these eminent lawyers take and applaud is of necessity a condemnation of Lincoln's whole life; for his great public career began and was throughout conditioned by his insistence in the *Dred Scott* case, upon the fact that the American people were the masters and not the servants of even the highest court in the land, and were thereby the final interpreters of the Constitution. If the courts have the final say so on all legislative acts, and if no appeal can lie from them to the people, then they are the irresponsible masters of the people. The only tenable excuse for such a position is the frank avowal that the people lack sufficient intelligence and morality to be fit to govern themselves. In other words, those who take this position hold that the people have enough intelligence to frame and adopt a constitution, but not enough intelligence to apply and interpret the constitution which they have themselves made. Those who take this position hold that the people are competent to choose officials to whom they delegate certain powers, but not competent to hold these officials responsible for the way they exercise these powers.

Now the power to interpret is the power to establish; and, if the people are not to be allowed finally to interpret the fundamental law, ours is not a popular government. The true view is that legislators and judges alike are the servants of the people, who have been created by the people just as the people have created the Constitution; and they hold only such power as the people have for the time being delegated to them. If these two sets of public servants disagree as to the amounts of power respectively delegated to them by the people under the Constitution, and if the case is of sufficient importance, then, as a matter of course, it should be the right of the people themselves to decide between them.

I do not say that the people are infallible. But I do say that our whole history shows that the American people are more often sound in their decisions than is the case with any of the governmental bodies to whom, for their convenience, they have delegated portions of their power. If this is not so, then there is no justification for the existence of our Government; and if it is so, then there is no justification for refusing to give the people the real, and not merely the nominal, ultimate decision on questions of constitutional law. Just as the people, and not the Supreme Court under Chief Justice Taney, were wise in their decisions of the vital questions of their day, so I hold that now the American people as a whole have shown themselves wiser than the courts in the way they have approached and dealt with such vital questions of our day as those concerning the proper control of big corporations and of securing their rights to industrial workers.

Here I am not dealing with theories; I am dealing with actual facts. In New York, in Illinois, in Connecticut, lamentable injustice has been perpetuated, often for many years, by decisions of the State courts refusing to permit the people of the States to exercise their right as a free people to do their duty as a conscientious people in removing grave wrong and social injustice. These foolish and iniquitous decisions have almost always been rendered at the expense of the weak; they have almost always been the means of putting a stop to the effort to remove burdens from wageworkers, to secure to men who toil on the farm and on the railway, or in the factory, better and safer conditions of labor and of life. Often the judges who have rendered these decisions have been entirely well-meaning men, who, however, did not know life as they knew law, and who championed some outworn political philosophy which they assumed to impose on the people. Their associations and surroundings were such that they had no conception of the cruelty and wrong their decisions caused and perpetuated. Their prime concern was with the empty ceremonial of perfunctory legalism, and not with the living spirit of justice. A typical case was the decision rendered but a few months ago by the court of appeals of my own State, the State of New York, declaring unconstitutional the workmen's compensation act. In their decision the judges admitted the wrong and the suffering caused by the practices against which the law was aimed. They admitted that other civilized nations had abolished these wrongs and practices. But they took the ground that the Constitution of the United States, instead of being an instrument to secure justice, had been ingeniously devised absolutely to prevent justice. They insisted that the clause in the Constitution which forbade the taking of property without due process of law forbade the effort which had been made in the law to distribute among all the partners in an enterprise the effects of the injuries to life or limb of a wageworker. In other words, they insisted that the Constitution had permanently cursed our people with impotence to right wrong, and had perpetuated a cruel iniquity; for cruel iniquity is not too harsh a term to use in describing the law which, in the event of such an accident, binds the whole burden of crippling disaster on the shoulders least able to bear it—the shoulders of the crippled man himself, or of the dead man's helpless wife and children. No anarchist orator, raving against the Constitution, ever framed an indictment of it so severe as these worthy and well-meaning judges must be held to have framed if their reasoning be accepted as true. But, as a matter of fact, their reasoning was unsound, and was as repugnant to every sound defender of the Constitution as to every believer in justice and righteousness. In effect, their decision was that we could not remedy these wrongs unless we amended the Constitution (not the constitution of the State, but the Constitution of the Nation) by saying that property could be taken without due process of law! It seems incredible that anyone should be willing to take such a position. It is a position that has been condemned over and over again by the wisest and most far-seeing courts. In its essence it was reversed by the decision of State courts in States like Washington and Iowa, and by the Supreme Court of the Nation in a case but a few weeks old.

I call this decision to the attention of those who shake their heads at the proposal to trust the people to decide for themselves what their own governmental policy shall be in these matters. I know of no popular vote by any State of the Union more flagrant in its defiance of right and justice, more short-sighted in its inability to face the changed needs of our civilization, than this decision by the highest court of the State of New York. Many of the judges of that court I know personally, and for them I have a profound regard. Even for as flagrant a decision as this I would not vote for their recall; for I have no doubt the decision was rendered in accordance with their ideas of duty. But most emphatically I do wish that the people should have the right to recall the decision itself, and authoritatively to stamp with disapproval what can not but seem to the ordinary plain citizen a monstrous misconstruction of the Constitution, a monstrous perversion of the Constitution into an instrument for the perpetuation of social and industrial wrong and for the oppression of the weak and helpless. No ordinary amendment to the Constitution would meet this type of case; and intolerable delay and injustice would be caused by the effort to get such amendment—not to mention the fact that the very judges who are at fault would proceed to construe the amendment. In such a case the fault is not with the Constitution; the fault is in the judges'

construction of the Constitution; and what is required is power for the people to reverse this false and wrong construction.

I wish I could make you visualize to yourselves what these decisions against which I so vehemently protest really represent of suffering and injustice. I wish I had the power to bring before you the man maimed or dead, the woman and children left to struggle against bitter poverty because the breadwinner has gone. I am not thinking of the terminology of the decision, nor of what seem to me the hair-splitting and meticulous arguments elaborately worked out to justify a great and a terrible miscarriage of justice. Moreover, I am not thinking only of the sufferers in any given case, but of the tens of thousands of others who suffer because of the way this case is decided. In the New York case the railway employee who was injured was a man named, I believe, Ives. The court admits that by every moral consideration he was entitled to recover as his due the money that the law intended to give him. Yet the court by its decision forces that man to stagger through life maimed, and keeps the money that should be his in the treasury of the company in whose service, as an incident of his regular employment and in the endurance of ordinary risks, he lost the ability to earn his own livelihood. There are thousands of Iveses in this country; thousands of cases such as this come up every year; and while this is true, while the courts deny essential and elementary justice to these men and give to them and the people in exchange for justice a technical and empty formula, it is idle to ask me not to criticize them. As long as injustice is kept thus intrenched by any court, I will protest as strongly as in me lies against such action. Remember, when I am asking the people themselves in the last resort to interpret the law which they themselves have made, that after all I am only asking that they step in and authoritatively reconcile the conflicting decisions of the courts. In all these cases the judges and courts have decided every which way, and it is foolish to talk of the sanctity of a judge-made law which half of the judges strongly denounce. If there must be decision by a close majority, then let the people step in and let it be their majority that decides.

According to one of the highest judges then and now on the Supreme Court of the Nation, we had lived for a hundred years under a Constitution which permitted a national income tax, until suddenly by one vote the Supreme Court reversed its previous decisions for a century and said that for a century we had been living under wrong interpretation of the Constitution (that is, under a wrong Constitution), and therefore in effect established a new Constitution which we are now laboriously trying to amend so as to get it back to be the Constitution that for a hundred years everybody, including the Supreme Court, thought it to be. When I was President we passed a national workmen's compensation act. Under it a railway man named Howard, I think, was killed in Tennessee, and his widow sued for damages. Congress had done all it could to provide the right, but the court stepped in and decreed that Congress had failed. Three of the judges took the extreme position that there was no way in which Congress could act to secure the helpless widow and children against suffering, and that the man's blood and the blood of all similar men when spilled should forever cry aloud in vain for justice. This seems a strong statement, but it is far less strong than the actual facts; and I have difficulty in making the statement with any degree of moderation. The nine justices of the Supreme Court on this question split into five fragments. One man, Justice Moody, in his opinion stated the case in its broadest way and demanded justice for Howard on grounds that would have meant that in all similar cases thereafter justice and not injustice should be done. Yet the court, by a majority of one, decided as I do not for one moment believe the court would now decide, and not only perpetuated a lamentable injustice in the case of the man himself, but set a standard of injustice for all similar cases. Here again I ask you not to think of the mere legal formalism, but to think of the great immutable principles of justice, the great immutable principles of right and wrong, and to ponder what it means to men dependent for their livelihood, and to the women and children dependent upon these men, when the courts of the land deny them the justice to which they are entitled.

Now, gentlemen, in closing, and in thanking you for your courtesy, let me add one word. Keep clearly in view what are the fundamental ends of government. Remember that methods are merely the machinery by which these ends are to be achieved. I hope that not only you and I but all our people may ever remember that while good laws are necessary, while it is necessary to have the

right kind of governmental machinery, yet that the all-important matter is to have the right kind of man behind the law. A State can not rise without proper laws, but the best laws that the wit of man can devise will amount to nothing if the State does not contain the right kind of man, the right kind of woman. A good constitution, and good laws under the constitution, and fearless and upright officials to administer the laws—all these are necessary; but the prime requisite in our national life is, and must always be, the possession by the average citizen of the right kind of character. Our aim must be the moralization of the individual, of the Government, of the people as a whole. We desire the moralization not only of political conditions but of industrial conditions, so that every force in the community, individual and collective, may be directed toward securing for the average man and average woman a higher and better and fuller life, in the things of the body no less than those of the mind and the soul.

APPENDIX.

MR. ROOSEVELT'S LETTER TO THE GOVERNORS.

NEW YORK, *February 24, 1912.*

GENTLEMEN: I deeply appreciate your letter, and I realize to the full the heavy responsibility it puts upon me, expressing as it does the carefully considered convictions of the men elected by popular vote to stand as the heads of government in their several States.

I absolutely agree with you that this matter is not one to be decided with any reference to the personal preferences or interests of any man, but purely from the standpoint of the interests of the people as a whole. I will accept the nomination for President if it is tendered to me, and I will adhere to this decision until the convention has expressed its preference.

One of the chief principles for which I have stood, and for which I now stand, and which I have always endeavored and always shall endeavor to reduce to action, is the genuine rule of the people; and therefore I hope that so far as possible the people may be given the chance, through direct primaries, to express their preference as to who shall be the nominee of the Republican presidential convention.

Very truly, yours,

THEODORE ROOSEVELT.



Free speech, Lincoln and
Congressional Record May 25, 1918
Roosevelt, Theodore



Mr. In and 7 see Speech Ph. 7619-7620.
See also Mr. 7615-7625.

Congressional Record.

SIXTY-FIFTH CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION.

Vol. 56.

WASHINGTON, SATURDAY, MAY 25, 1918.

No. 140.

SENATE.

SATURDAY, May 25, 1918.

Rev. J. L. Kibler, of the city of Washington, offered the following prayer:

We thank Thee, O God, for that voice which calls us, in our need, to look upward to Thee and which speaks to us as only God can speak to a human soul. We thank Thee for those lofty principles which emanate from Thee and which are born in our hearts under the influence of Thy redeeming love and which are designed to direct all our steps aright.

O God, help us to walk according to this rule. In all our hopes and plans and ambitions for peace or war, at home or abroad, on the land, on the sea, may we seek to make the world better only by bringing ourselves into harmony with Thy will, in the accomplishment of Thy purposes, and in the carrying out of Thy plans. We ask it for Christ's sake. Amen.

The Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, May 23, 1918, when, on request of Mr. CHAMBERLAIN and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with and the Journal was approved.

THEODORE ROOSEVELT.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I present and ask to have printed in the RECORD a communication from Theodore Roosevelt in answer to a letter of the Postmaster General relative to the regulation of the passage through the mails of newspapers and other publications.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE KANSAS CITY STAR.
OFFICE OF THEODORE ROOSEVELT,
347 MADISON AVENUE,
New York, May 22, 1918.

MY DEAR SENATOR POINDEXTER: The following article from me appeared in the Kansas City Star on May 7, 1918:

"Sedition, a Free Press, and Personal Rule."

"The legislation now being enacted by Congress should deal drastically with sedition. It should also guarantee the right of the press and people to speak the truth freely of all their public servants, including the President, and to criticize them in the severest terms of truth whenever they come short in their public duty. Finally, Congress should grant the Executive the amplest powers to act as an Executive and should hold him to stern accountability for failure so to act, but it should itself do the actual lawmaking and should clearly define the lines and limits of action and should retain and use the fullest powers of investigation into and supervision over such action. Sedition is a form of treason. It is an offense against the country, not against the President. At this time to oppose the draft or sending our armies to Europe, to uphold Germany, to attack our allies, to oppose raising the money necessary to carry on the war are at least forms of moral sedition, while to act as a German spy or to encourage German spies, to use money or intrigue in the corrupt service of Germany, to tamper with our war manufactures and to encourage our soldiers to desert or to fail in their duty, and all similar actions, are forms of undoubtedly illegal sedition. For some of these offenses death should be summarily inflicted. For all the punishment should be severe.

"The administration has been gravely remiss in dealing with such acts.

"Free speech, exercised both individually and through a free press, is a necessity in any country where the people are themselves free. Our Government is the servant of the people, whereas in Germany it is the master of the people. This is because the American people are free and the German people are not free. The President is merely the most important among a large number of public servants. He should be supported or opposed exactly to the degree which is warranted by his good conduct or bad conduct, his efficiency or inefficiency, in rendering loyal, able, and disinterested service to the Nation as a whole. Therefore it is absolutely necessary that there should be full liberty to tell the truth about his acts, and this means that it is exactly as necessary to blame him when he does wrong as to praise him when he does right. Any other attitude in an American citizen is both base and servile. To announce that there must be no criticism of the President, or that we are to stand by the President, right or wrong, is not only unpatriotic and servile, but is morally treasonable to the American public. Nothing but the truth should be spoken about him or anyone else. But it is even more important to tell the truth, pleasant or unpleasant, about him than about anyone else.

"During the last year the administration has shown itself anxious to punish the newspapers which uphold the war, but which have told the truth about the administration's failure to conduct the war efficiently; whereas it has failed to proceed against various powerful news-

papers which opposed the war or attacked our allies or directly or indirectly aided Germany against this country, as these papers upheld the administration and defended its inefficiency. Therefore, no additional power should be given the administration to deal with papers for criticizing the administration. And, moreover, Congress should closely scrutinize the way the Postmaster General and Attorney General have already exercised discrimination between the papers they prosecuted and the papers they failed to prosecute.

"Congress should give the President full power for efficient executive action. It should not abrogate its own power. It should define how he is to reorganize the administration. It should say how large an army we are to have and not leave the decision to the amiable Secretary of War, who has for two years shown such inefficiency. It should declare for an army of 5,000,000 men and inform the Secretary that it would give him more the minute he asks for more."

Thereupon Postmaster General Burleson issued the following statement:

"OFFICE OF INFORMATION,
"POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT,
"May 8, 1918.

"Postmaster General Burleson to-day made the following statement with reference to the editorial signed by Col. Roosevelt which appeared in this morning's paper:

"Ex-President Roosevelt in the newspapers this morning made the following statement:

"During the last year the administration has shown itself anxious to punish the newspapers which upheld the war, but which told the truth about the administration's failure to conduct the war efficiently; whereas it has failed to proceed against various powerful newspapers which opposed the war or attacked our allies or directly or indirectly aided Germany against this country, as those papers upheld the administration and defended the inefficiency."

"This statement, taken in connection with other published statements of Mr. Roosevelt, is manifestly aimed at the administration of the Postal Service. It is either true or false. If true, I am utterly unworthy of trust and should be scourged from office in disgrace. If false, right thinking men and women will form their own opinion of the man who uttered it. Its truth or falsity is easily demonstrable. I invite Mr. Roosevelt to name the papers or magazines which have 'upheld the war but which told the truth about the administration's failure to conduct the war efficiently' which have been 'punished' by the Post Office Department. I invite Mr. Roosevelt to name the newspapers or magazines, powerful or otherwise, which have opposed the war and attacked our allies or directly or indirectly aided Germany against this country' in such manner as to violate the law, which have not been proceeded against by this department.

"Failure on the part of Mr. Roosevelt to respond is to admit his inability to do so."

As this was issued officially by the Postmaster General, I desire that a permanent record shall be made of my answer and of the facts that led up to my statement to which the Postmaster General took exception, and which caused him to issue his challenge to me to prove my statement. I therefore wish to put these facts before you in full.

I insert as appendixes to this letter the editorial in the Metropolitan Magazine, in the issue which the New York post office attempted to suppress, this editorial being entitled "Put the Blame Where It Belongs"; and my article in the Metropolitan on "Lincoln and Free Speech"; together with the Metropolitan statement as to its war record (p. 6, May Metropolitan).

I deal with Mr. Burleson and his actions purely because he is the representative of President Wilson, exactly as is Secretary Baker, exactly as is Mr. Creel. President Wilson is responsible for everything that Postmaster General Burleson and Secretary Baker and Mr. Creel do or leave undone. Nothing that any one of these gentlemen says, nothing that any one of them does, and nothing that any one of them leaves undone is of the slightest importance, except because he is President Wilson's representative, appointed by President Wilson to a position of high governmental importance in a great crisis and serving as the medium through which President Wilson carries out his policies affecting this country. This is, of course, equally true of all of President Wilson's other appointees. I have scant patience with the timidity or the folly which dares not hold accountable the source of power, and only ventures to express displeasure with the instrument through which the power is exercised. Messrs. Burleson, Baker, Creel, and their associates possess no importance whatever, except that accruing to them because it is through them that the President speaks and acts, or refuses or fails to act. As the above article shows, I was not speaking of Mr. Burleson in particular but of the administration of which he is a part, of the President whose servant he is.

The reason for my comment in the Kansas City Star and for my previous article in the Metropolitan Magazine is that since the war began the Administration has used the very great war powers of the Government over the public press to stifle honest criticism of governmental inefficiency or misconduct, while condoning (which necessarily means encouraging) pro-German, anti-Ally, and therefore anti-American agitation in certain powerful papers which defended this inefficiency and misconduct; and it has sought from Congress a great addition to the already existing power it has thus misused. I believe that the first article of the Constitution guarantees the right of the people to criticize truthfully the conduct of their public servants, and that this right can not be taken away by any law. But the average man is naturally and properly afraid to challenge a law backed by the whole power of the United States Government, even although it may be his belief that ultimately the law will be held unconstitutional.

Our governmental officers, from the President down, are of right the servants of the people, not the rulers of the people. This is the fundamental difference between an autocracy and a democracy. The Hohenzollerns are the rulers of Germany, and the Germans are the subjects of the Hohenzollerns, not their fellow citizens. On the contrary, our Presidents are not the rulers of the American people, but the servants of the American people, and the rest of the people are their fellow citizens. Our duty is to stand by the country. It is our duty to stand by the President—as by every other official—just so long as he stands by the country. It is no less our duty to oppose him whenever, and to the extent that, he does not stand by the country. If we fail to oppose him under such conditions, we are guilty of moral treason to the country. The President and our other public officials are subject to the laws just like the rest of us. It is an infamy untruthfully to assail our public servants—or anyone else. But it is our duty to tell the truth about our public servants, whether the truth be pleasant or unpleasant. The higher the public servant and the more important his task, the more careful we should be to speak only the truth about him; and the more necessary it is that we should tell the full truth about him.

During the past year the action of the administration, taken largely through the Post Office Department, has been such as to render it a matter of some danger for any man, and especially any newspaper, to speak the truth, if that truth be unpleasant to the governmental authorities at Washington. The effect of this attitude has been very marked politically. Such coercive power tends to make upright men, even although they are strong men, cautious about telling truths which ought to be told. It forces weak men to praise the administration whether it does well or ill. It invites unscrupulous men who desire to serve Germany to gain license to do so, and to secure advantages by praising the administration, especially when it has acted wrongfully or inefficiently, and by supporting it politically. There are cases where all competent and honest observers are morally certain that political support has been given, and is now being given, to the administration by various newspapers, especially German-American and semisocialistic newspapers, because of the club thus held over them by the administration. From the very nature of the case there can rarely be positive proof in such cases. But as regards the most striking cases of favoritism, those concerning the Hearst papers, as compared with the suppression of Tom Watson's paper, and the attack (for nominally wholly different reasons) on the Metropolitan, I herein give the facts which prove exactly what I have alleged. The Postmaster General has raised the issue; I meet it squarely; and he shall not evade it. The administration has successfully endeavored to prevent expression of opinion hostile to it and to put a premium upon supporting the President personally and politically without regard to whether his actions are detrimental or beneficial to the country.

The administration, through the Publicity Bureau, under the lead of Mr. Creel, is conducting a gigantic news propaganda with the public money. Mr. Creel's activities are exercised nominally on behalf of the country, but in reality primarily on behalf of the administration. Mr. Creel announces and publishes himself as the special representative of the President, and is permitted by the President so to announce and publish himself. He assails the publications that truthfully expose the shortcomings of the administration; and, without regard to the facts, he, personally and through his bureau, actively upholds the administration as regards those matters, such as the aircraft program, in which there have been grave governmental shortcomings. This is partisan political propaganda of the very worst type, carried on with public moneys, under the guise of public work. The editor of the Metropolitan wrote Mr. Creel, on March 7:

"Is it right that you should use the time and money of your bureau, which is supported by the American taxpayers, to defend members of the administration from criticism in the public press? Are you not in fact the personal press agent of the President and members of the administration?"

What the editor of the Metropolitan thus stated in the form of a query should be stated affirmatively as an unquestioned fact.

I have said so much by the way of making the general situation clear. Now, as to Postmaster General Burleson's challenge. This can be divided into two parts: First, Mr. Burleson denies that the administration has ever discriminated improperly against any publication, and, second, he denies that it has ever failed to proceed against any publication which ought to have been proceeded against.

First, The Metropolitan Magazine, Collier's Weekly, and the New York Tribune have consistently upheld the war. They eagerly demanded that we should go to war, they supported the President in going to war, they have cordially upheld every measure for prosecuting the war. But they have also told, not all of the truth, but some small portion of the truth, which it was absolutely necessary to tell, about the administration's failure to conduct the war efficiently. They have only told even this small portion of the truth when it was imperative so to do, in order to speed up the war and to prevent perseverance in inefficiency. All three publications have been attacked by Mr. Creel officially, speaking as President Wilson's representative and "as giving a message from the United States Government to the American people." (I quote from *The Independent*.) The Post Office Department, through the New York postmaster, on March 2 last, notified the publishers of the Metropolitan Magazine that its March issue was nonmailable under the espionage act. This action was widely published throughout the country. It was calculated to do great damage to the Metropolitan. It was precisely the kind of action which, as I know by having been so assured again and again by various editors, was the reason why these editors have been afraid to tell the truth or even a small part of the truth about our governmental inefficiency or misdeeds. The article on which the action was nominally based was by a man who had written articles of exactly the same kind in a publication, the New Republic, which, however, is a political supporter of Mr. Wilson, and has not been interfered with. The Metropolitan is not a political supporter of Mr. Wilson and was interfered with, yet the Metropolitan has upheld the war far more zealously than the New Republic. The Metropolitan immediately asked the postmaster of New York for the grounds of his action, but got no answer. On March 9 it telegraphed the Postmaster General, asking whether the action was taken by the order of the Postmaster General and, if not, what steps the Postmaster General would take to repair the damage done to the Metropolitan Magazine. On March 11 the Postmaster General replied to the Metropolitan, stating that accusations had been made that an article in the Metropolitan was a traitorous effusion, but that he did not know whether the complaints were justified, and that no order had been issued about it by the department. He did not answer the Metropolitan's question as to what steps would be taken to repair the damage done it by the conduct of the New York postmaster. On the same day the

New York postmaster wrote the Metropolitan reversing his action of March 2, but making no apology and making no excuse. On March 12 the editor of the Metropolitan wrote to Mr. Burleson saying, among other things, "You must remember that there are a great number of pacifists and pro-Germans in this country who would willingly put the Metropolitan Magazine out of business because it is the most strongly pro-Ally and anti-German publication in the country," calling attention to the fact that a statement attributed to the Solicitor General of the department was obviously not in accord with the facts, and that the Metropolitan could not accept newspaper statements without confirmation from the Postmaster General, and asking for a written statement from the Postmaster General in the matter. He has received no such statement, nor has any attempt been made by the Post Office Department to remedy the wrong it did by the postmaster at New York.

At the same time one of the advertisers in the Metropolitan, Mr. E. M. Mansur, of Floral Park, N. Y., received a letter from a man in Chicago suggesting that he withdraw his advertisement because of the editorials in the Metropolitan Magazine. Mr. Mansur declined to withdraw it. On April 3 he notified the Metropolitan that a special agent of the United States Department of Justice, named James A. Corcoran, with shield No. 436, giving his address as Box 241, Park Row, New York City, called on him with copies of the letters of this Chicago man to him and of the replies and asked if Mr. Mansur had stopped advertising, and wanted to know if he was going on advertising next year, and then if he were an American citizen. The last query taken in connection with the first two contained, of course, an implication that was in effect a threat. This shows that the Department of Justice had knowledge of the attempt to boycott the Metropolitan and lent its official power to further it, unless the man in question had stolen the special agent's shield which he possessed and forged his name and address.

The above facts Mr. Burleson has not denied, and can not truthfully deny, and they absolutely demonstrate the exactness of my statement, so far as the administration's effort to punish the publications which upheld the war but have told the truth about the administration's failure to conduct the war efficiently.

Now, for the second part of my statement: The prime example of failure by the administration to proceed against newspapers which oppose the war or attack our allies and therefore directly or indirectly aid Germany is afforded by the failure of the administration to deal with Mr. Hearst's papers as it has dealt with certain other papers. Mr. Hearst is a very wealthy man, reputed to be much more than a millionaire, owning a dozen newspapers, more or less, and a half dozen magazines, in different parts of the country. At the very beginning of the war the Government proceeded successfully against Tom Watson's publication in Georgia. I entirely disagreed with Tom Watson's general political philosophy; I was utterly opposed to his contention that drafted men should not be sent overseas to fight; I regarded him as a narrow, although an upright and sincere, man. But he had done nothing that was anything like as dangerous to this country and our allies and as helpful to Germany as Mr. Hearst was at that very time doing. The circulation of Mr. Watson's paper was very small compared to Mr. Hearst's papers, his wealth and influence were infinitesimal compared to Mr. Hearst's wealth and influence, and he had denounced Germany and even advocated war against Germany, whereas Mr. Hearst had in numerous editorials opposed our going to war, attacked Germany's foes, and defended Germany. Yet the administration crushed Tom Watson, a poor man, while it first tolerated and then encouraged wealthy, powerful Mr. Hearst. Tom Watson's paper was not the only small paper the Postmaster General attacked and hampered for doing far less than Mr. Hearst's papers had done. The New York News is edited by George W. Harris, a colored man, for the colored race. Under date of May 2, last, Mr. Harris, the editor, received a notice from the postmaster of New York that the issue of that date had been "withheld from dispatch through the mails, pending advice from the Solicitor for the Post Office Department as to whether this issue is mailable." One of the editors of the paper informs me that Mr. Harris called at the post office in New York to ascertain the reason of this order, but was not given any reason. The only explanation the editors could think of was that the paper had contained a protest against an alleged order of a colonel in the Army "directing colored officers not to enforce upon white inferiors a military salute." Certainly nothing in this humble paper warranted the administration, through the Post Office Department, in attacking it, while at the same time not venturing to interfere with the wealthy Hearst papers.

Mr. Burleson, however, while he will pardon certain proadministration papers, even although they are antiwar, will nevertheless occasionally attack not only antiwar but prowar and even proadministration, radical papers, if he objects to their radicalism. Two entirely responsible persons have called my attention to the suppression of one issue of a radical magazine called *The Public*. This has been an entirely prowar magazine. In its issue of March 30 it urged editorially "heavier taxation of unearned incomes and of excess profits" and the raising of more money by direct taxation in preference to bond issues. Apparently, as far as the editors can make out, it was because of this article this issue was suppressed. A former editor of the paper writes me that it is possible that Mr. Burleson objected to the paper because of an account of an interview with him on October 12 last, in which he was quoted as stating his lack of sympathy with the proposition that a man ought not to get his money from the ownership of land which was filled by tenants, on the ground that he could not be expected to favor a public policy where his interest lay on the other side of the proposition. "As a landowner you can't expect me to believe that," he is reported as saying. It does not appear, however, that any steps were taken because of this article. The question, therefore, is as to the right of *The Public* to print the editorial in the issue of March 30. The question as to our belief or our disbeliever in the soundness of this editorial has nothing whatever to do with the case. There are plenty of conservative doctrines with which I emphatically disagree, and also plenty of radical doctrines with which I disagree; and if it should happen that on either side of the case I found myself in agreement with Mr. Burleson I should, nevertheless, adhere to my beliefs. But, unless these doctrines were seditious, or represented the kind of immorality and incitement to violence or other unlawful conduct (which would properly bring them under the law), I would fight as stoutly for the right of the editor to publish them as I would fight for my own right to publish articles against them. Such action as that of Mr. Burleson does not help the war; on the contrary, it tends to keep people so angry with the agents of the war that they become and remain hostile to the war itself.

There could be no more striking example of discrimination than that furnished by the contrast between the treatment of a paper like Mr. Watson's and papers like those of Mr. Hearst; there was severity of

treatment for the helpless, while the strong were given complete immunity.

There is no need to rely upon my statement that the Metropolitan has been a loyal, prowar, pro-American publication. In a letter published by Mr. Creel, since Mr. Burleson's statement was published, he states: "We reply to the Metropolitan for the very reason that we do not reply to antiwar or anti-American papers. They are known to be what they are, but the reputation of the Metropolitan for loyalty gives weight to its misstatements." This is, as shown by the use of the word "we," a complete and full acknowledgment on the part of Mr. Creel that my statements with regard to the administration in this matter are correct. It is a complete and full acknowledgment that the administration acts against a publication whose loyalty is unquestioned, but which attacks the kind of governmental inefficiency which tells in favor of Germany, although at the same time the administration does not act against the "antiwar or anti-American papers"—so long, I may add incidentally, as these papers champion the administration and apologize for the inefficiency of its actions.

Since the Postmaster General's challenge to me was made public, private citizens have taken against the Hearst papers the action which the administration has refused to take. The New York American, in publishing President Wilson's Memorial Day proclamation omitted that part of the proclamation which contained the prayer for victory, although it printed the part containing the prayer for peace—a proceeding entirely in consonance with Mr. Hearst's advocacy of a "peace without victory." In Poughkeepsie, according to a special dispatch to the New York Herald of May 13, a party of Grand Army veterans protested against such action by procuring every available copy of the American and burning them in the courthouse square, the veterans explaining, through Maj. Louis C. Dietz, organizer, of the local Loyal Service League, that they did this because they regarded the action of the New York American as an attempt "to fool the people of this country by publishing articles that are perfectly agreeable to the Kaiser's Government and to traitors and pro-Germans that are in this country." At the same time, according to the statements in the New York Times and New York World, the mayor and common council of Mount Vernon, N. Y., barred the Hearst papers for the period of the war from Mount Vernon, the mover of the ordinance reading various extracts from Mr. Hearst's papers which he said moved him to take the action he did, while the mayor announced that he signed the bill because he wished "to put a curb on the Kaiser or any of his agents" and that "Mount Vernon will not stand for anything or anyone not wholly American at this time." The mayor of Summit, N. J., is reported to have succeeded in getting the news dealers to refuse to handle the Hearst publications.

I have before me at the moment copies of the New York American editorials of May 11, May 20, June 1, 1915, and an editorial of June 6, 1915, signed by Mr. Hearst himself, dealing with the *Lusitania* question and stating that Germany's action was right about the *Lusitania*; that "the *Lusitania* incident is, of course, no cause for a declaration of war," and that we had no just cause for complaint in the matter—saying that we "had no right to make this demand * * * that Germany suspend her submarine warfare against the commerce of the allies," that we had "no right to question Germany's use of submarines in her warfare upon British commerce," and that the *Lusitania* was an English vessel and properly "subject to destruction," and that its destruction by the German submarine was in accordance with the authorized and accepted rules of warfare, and that Germany's methods of submarine warfare "were none of our business." The Hearst papers continued to try to make our people range themselves against England, and therefore in favor of Germany, and to appeal to the people of the United States to put the safety of their dollars above the safety of their women and children. In the issue of the New York American of August 25, 1915, is an editorial headed, "Must the United States be a cat's-paw for England against Germany?" There is not a word in this editorial about the German murder of our women and children on the high seas, not a word protesting against Germany's taking the lives of our citizens, but a scream against England because she had made cotton contraband of war! No American can read this editorial in the Hearst papers of that date without hanging his head in shame that such papers should at this time be backed by the American administration.

Let the administration recall that Mr. Hearst was writing these editorials, week after week, month after month, during the time succeeding the sinking of the *Lusitania*. On December 5 last, Secretary Baker, the official representative of the President in all matters relating to the war, said, as reported in the public press: "From the moment the *Lusitania* was sent to a watery grave by the hands of the assassin, the United States had only two choices. The United States could have crawled on its knees to the Hohenzollerns, crying out that their frightfulness and their military efficiency were too great and that we submit and become their vassal; or, as an alternative we could fight. We chose to fight." This is the description by President Wilson's Secretary of War of the course (that we become the vassal of Germany) which Mr. Hearst, through his papers, did his utmost to get the American people to adopt.

After we went into the war, on April 11, 1917, Mr. Hearst wrote: "Stripping our country of men, money, and food is a dangerous policy. Our earnest suggestion to the Congress is that it imperatively refuse to permit the further draining of our food supplies and our military supplies to Europe." This was equivalent to a demand that after going to war we should turn around and help Germany more than if we had continued to remain neutral. On April 24, 1917, the New York American said: "The painful truth is that we are being practically used as a mere reinforcement of England's warfare and England's future aggrandizement." This was an effort against our ally and an effort to pandering to anti-English prejudice in the interest of our foes, and nothing else. On May 17, it advocated our spending all our money on preparing our Army and Navy here at home "and so compelling Germany if she wants to fight to come to us," which was, of course, equivalent to arguing that we would render no aid to defeat Germany until she had defeated our allies and was prepared to attack us single-handed. On May 25, the same paper said of the efforts to float the liberty loan: "If you want our food and wealth sent abroad to help suffering England, buy a liberty bond, furnish the sinews of war." In view of Hearst's continued effort to excite hatred between the United States and England, the implication of this sentence can not be mistaken. In the very next sentence he subtly attempts to appeal to all men with a feeling of affection for Germany by intimating that whoever purchased a liberty bond desired to see Germany not merely defeated but "dis-membered." On July 27, the New York American spoke of our soldiers being sent over "to be offered up in bloody sacrifice to the

annihilation of contending nations on foreign battlefields." On November 22 it spoke of our "interfering in Europe's quarrels."

It is absolutely impossible to reconcile the Government's action in proceeding against Tom Watson's paper with its failure to proceed against Mr. Hearst's papers, on any theory that justice was to be done alike to the strong and to the weak.

The above quotations from Mr. Hearst's papers and many others like them may be found in recent issues of the New York Tribune. The Government had full notice about Hearst's, because the allies had barred him from the cable service, and only through the good offices of this Government have these privileges just now been restored to Mr. Hearst. Nor is this all. A mass meeting of thousands of citizens of New York was held in Carnegie Hall on November 2, 1917, under the auspices of the American Defense Society to protest against the spirit of disloyalty shown by certain persons, especially Mr. Hearst. Mr. James M. Beck delivered an address dealing for the most part with Mr. Hearst. This portion of the address I have also included in the appendixes. The New York Times, among other papers, printed this address almost in full. The Government, therefore, had full warning and full knowledge of all of Mr. Hearst's activities. Mr. Hearst's papers have defended our war inefficiencies, have apologized for the failures in the war program, and have even denied such breakdowns as that in the aircraft program. It is true that since we entered the war Mr. Hearst has at various times issued editorials professing great patriotic zeal; but it was at the very time when in other editorials he was attacking the allies of America, England and Japan, in the most offensive way, and at the very time when he was upholding the Russian Bolsheviks, who had made Russia a traitor to the free nations of the world and a subservient ally of the German autocracy. Such action can not fail to give aid and comfort to Germany.

By turning to the New York Tribune of May 8, 1918, Postmaster General Burleson will find an ardent tribute paid by the former German correspondent of the *Koelnische Zeitung* to Mr. Hearst, and Mr. Hearst's editor in chief, Mr. Arthur Brisbane, for having been "auxiliaries of valued influence" to Germany, especially because of "the editorials in the Hearst newspapers." In the New York Times of August 14, 1917, there is a quotation by special cable, via The Hague, from the German *Vossische Zeitung*, which states that the "antiwar movement in America is gaining in strength" and that "war propagandists in the New York press have lately met stout resistance from no other than Mr. Hearst and his 30 papers by the issuance of warnings to the people about the danger of plunging into European war," and continues to speak of "the generous nature of the work he had done for Germany" and that Mr. Hearst "preached" in behalf of the central powers. Mr. Hearst earned the praise thus given him by the servants of the Kaiser, and during the time when he was earning it the Kaiser was saying to Ambassador Gerard, as the latter recites in his book: "America had better look out after this war. I shall stand no nonsense from America after the war"—which the ambassador reported to the administration at Washington, without, by the way, producing any effect upon the administration.

Mr. Brisbane in the Washington Times ably followed Mr. Hearst's lead. On August 8, 1917, it said: "The most powerful and effective peace worker in this country is William Randolph Hearst. The world wants peace. It is more important than victory." On July 16, 1917, when Russia was under a democratic government and still a fighting ally of the United States against Germany, Mr. Brisbane's paper, the Washington Times, said: "Anarchy rules in Russia; somebody must do something. The natural somebody is Germany, right next door to Russia * * * the civilization of western Europe may be very grateful to Germany if the war finds Germany with enough strength left to undertake the maintaining of order in Russia, developing the resources there and making a few billion of rubles in the process." It seems literally incredible that a paper making an utterance like this could have been left unmolested by an administration that had proceeded against poor Tom Watson—and this paper was published within two blocks of the White House. On August 21, 1917, this paper said: "We have lent to our allies about two thousand millions * * * this we lent our allies to help in the game of murder."

I commend these facts to Mr. Burleson, and also to his Cabinet associate, Mr. Daniels, in view of their recent telegrams of congratulations to Mr. Brisbane, upon assuming charge of certain Chicago papers, reported as being Hearst papers. These telegrams have been published in one of Mr. Hearst's New York papers, the Evening Journal. Mr. Burleson says of Mr. Hearst's alter ego that he "congratulates" the people of Chicago because they are to have the benefit of Mr. Brisbane's "able and unselfish efforts * * * I indulge the hope that (his paper) will always stand for justice and freedom and true democratic Government." And Mr. Daniels goes Mr. Burleson one better in expressing the belief that Mr. Brisbane will preach "patriotism" and "civic righteousness."

Mr. Burleson has stated that he has received "more complaints" about my writings than about those of Mr. Hearst. In view of Mr. Burleson's record and actions, there is small cause for wonder in this. Every pro-German and anti-American, every believer in a feeble American war and a triumphant German peace, every man who follows Mr. Hearst, would naturally appeal for sympathy to Mr. Burleson in denunciation of what I have done.

Messrs. Hearst and Brisbane, through their papers, have been unceasing in their attacks upon England and Japan. The New York American on December 20, 1917, said that "the offensive and defensive alliance then negotiated between Japan and England was aimed at the United States." This deliberate falsehood was published at the very time that England was defending us with her fleet and her army. There could be no meaner example of treachery to our allies and of subservience to our enemy. It was a thousand times more worth the attention of Mr. Burleson than anything done by the small papers against which the Post Office Department did act. On September 15, 1917, Mr. Hearst's plea for a German peace in the New York American ran "that the best peace for all concerned is a peace without victory, a peace without conquest, a peace without indemnities, a peace without annexations." On March 2, 1918, Mr. Hearst made an embittered attack upon Japan and on March 20 he repeated the attack. He spoke of the "military despotism of Japan," of the "brutal oriental selfishness in Japan's present attitude," and then asked the question as to who was going to drive her from Siberia, answering it: "Not the allies, for they are too much occupied with their war. Not the United States, because we are putting all our eggs in the allies' basket. There is one combination possible which might drive Japan out of Siberia and that is Russia in an active and aggressive alliance with the Teutonic Empires." These sentences amount to incitement to Russia to become the military ally and there-

fore the military vassal of Germany, and to the effort to persuade our people that the war is not our war, but only the war of the allies—that it is “their war.” Such language as this, used less than two months before Mr. Bursleson issued his challenge to me, is a thousand times more damaging to the United States than anything ever said by Tom Watson, or any other of the editors of small papers. For Mr. Bursleson to allow the paper making such an appeal to go unchallenged, and yet at the same time to permit, without rebuke, the New York post office to attack a publication like the Metropolitan is incompatible with the supposition that he was thinking only of the welfare of the country.

Mr. Hearst's paper actually stated that it believed “that our Government made a great mistake when it did not meet both English aggressions and German aggressions * * * with armed resistance.” This was announced during the war. Yet at this very time England is protecting us from Germany, and without that protection we would be given no time in which slowly to make ready to protect ourselves. If we had begun to prepare in August, 1914, we would have needed no protection from others. But we refused to prepare, and therefore we owe our safety now only to the fact that our friends are able to fight for us against our enemies while we are slowly preparing to fight for ourselves. And Mr. Hearst, under these conditions, expresses regret that we did not go to war against the friend who fought for us! Such a proposal is a proposal in the interest of the enemy, who murdered our women and children.

On September 22, 1917, when the American Nation still had no troops in the trenches, when we had only lent money to the allies, Mr. Hearst touched the nadir of the policy that puts the dollar above the man when he stated that “our Government has the right and power to dictate the terms of peace, and the American people expect England and the other allied Governments to recognize that right and to accept the terms laid down,” the statement being preceded by the following: “Having practically exhausted the resources of Russia, France, and Italy, the English Government now seeks succor in our American resources. The money of the American people has been loaned to the allies in great sums. Still greater sums are in readiness to lend them.” Statements like this can not but aid Germany. In all of Mr. Hearst's career it may well be doubted whether he has ever proposed anything more sordid than this suggestion to the American people, to a free people with a glorious past, a people proudly able and willing to fight for its honor. The proposal is that we should treat having lent money to the allies as offsetting the fact that these allies had shed the blood of millions of their sons in protecting not only themselves but this country from the brutal dominion of Germany—a dominion under which, if Mr. Hearst's advice had been followed, this country would now be cowering. The debt the allies owe to us for our money is infinitesimal compared to the debt that we owe them for the blood shed by their sons on battle fields where this Nation had as much at stake as the nations whose armies fought thereon. On March 8 last Mr. Hearst, preaching hatred to Japan, and using language tending to serve Germany by bringing about a break between the United States and Japan and perhaps Great Britain, says, “if Great Britain can not restrain her special ally, Japan, from acts of aggression inimical to our interests, we can remove our ships and troops from Europe and transfer them to Asia.” This is a threat of war with Japan—a threat that we will enter on a war of aggression in Asia. There could be no possible result of such a threat except service to Germany. It was a threat to abandon the war against Germany, our enemy, and embark on a war against Japan, our ally; and this because Japan, in the interest of the allies and of civilization, had contemplated action in East Siberia against the Bolsheviks, who have shown themselves to be the allies of Germany, the enemies of civilization, and the enemies of the United States.

These quotations show that Mr. Hearst has steadily endeavored to belittle the vital importance to our country of this war, and to excite the hatred of our people against allies who are faithfully fighting beside us; and such conduct can be of help only to Germany, to the enemy we are fighting. Just so long as Mr. Hearst's publications are permitted in the mails, Mr. Bursleson is without excuse for excluding any other publication from them. The administration by its acquiescence permits the continuance of Mr. Hearst's campaign which necessarily tends to give aid and comfort to Germany and to impair the morale of our own people.

The quotations above given deprive Mr. Bursleson and the administration, of which he is part, of any shred of justification for their action and inaction. Mr. Bursleson is, of course, only secondarily responsible in the matter. Mr. Hearst's papers are so important and Mr. Hearst's position among the administration's political friends, supporters, and advisers is so prominent, and the action in connection with reinstating him in his cable privileges was so purely dependent upon the President himself, that no subordinate of the President can accept or be credited with the chief responsibility for any action or inaction of the administration in relation to Mr. Hearst. The administration is responsible for the toleration of Mr. Hearst's anti-alley, antiwar, and therefore anti-American activities, and for the reward, nevertheless, given him; and the service rendered on the other side by Mr. Hearst was service to the administration and not to the country. I have quoted above the language of complimentary indorsement in which two of President Wilson's Cabinet ministers have addressed Mr. Hearst's editor, Mr. Brisbane. The President's private secretary writes Mr. Brisbane in the same vein. In the Chicago Herald and Examiner of May 19, last Sunday, appears the following letter, under the heading, “A New Subscriber”:

“THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, May 14, 1918.

“MY DEAR BRISBANE: When you were at the White House offices today, I forgot to ask you to send me the Chicago Herald and Examiner regularly to my office here. I am sure you are going to make the same good Democratic fight in Chicago that you have been making in your paper in Washington, and I want to see just how you do it.

“Sincerely, yours,

“J. P. TUMULTY,
Secretary to the President.

“MR. ARTHUR BRISBANE,
Care Chicago Herald and Examiner, Chicago, Ill.”

Mr. George Harvey has pointed out in the North American Review War Weekly that Mr. Bursleson is encouraging enemy-language publications by having a special division whose function is to assist editors of foreign-language papers “in complying with the law.” The act of Congress provides that all foreign-language papers should submit to censorship or go out of business. The Post Office Department's duty is merely to suppress those of them which are guilty of treasonable practices. Apparently, as Mr. Harvey points out, Mr. Bursleson, instead of sup-

pressing papers that preach sedition, establishes a division to show them how they can escape suppression. Mr. Hearst's papers are infinitely the most important of those which during the last year and a quarter have tended to serve Germany and have harmed the United States by attacking our allies or opposing our effective participation in the war. There are various other papers published in English or German which have been less important offenders. On April 2, Prof. Guernsey Jones, of the University of Nebraska, published an article in the Nebraska State Journal on “The Enemy Press.” He quoted various articles that have appeared in German-American papers since the war, and some of them as late as January, February, and March last, championing the German-American Alliance, attacking England and Japan, announcing that “the problem of the German press is to save Deutschland in the United States,” demanding a peace which would give Germany the victory, praising Germany's action toward Russia, and in other ways, as Prof. Jones says, showing themselves to be “insolent organs of Prussianism.” These papers were being published, and Mr. Hearst was publishing his papers, without interference by the Post Office Department and the Government, at the same time that proceedings were being taken against the Metropolitan Magazine, one of the staunchest upholders of the war and staunchest opponents of Prussianism in all the United States.

Congress has with lavish generosity granted all the administration has demanded to carry on the war. It has also granted the administration extraordinary power, of a kind never hitherto granted any administration, to deal with the internal foes of the Nation; and this power can be and has been misused to reward the administration's personal or political supporters and punish the administration's personal or political opponents. Congress, through such bodies as the Senate Committee on Military Affairs, has exercised its power of investigation and supervision to correct executive inefficiency, executive delay, and executive abuse of power, and has done this in such fashion as to speed up and render immensely more efficient our part in the war. Congress should vigilantly exercise its right of supervision as regards the use of all the great powers it has granted the administration over the properties and activities of the citizens of the United States.

In his last statement about me Mr. Bursleson, like Mr. Wegg, at the behest of Mr. Boffin, dropped into verse. As he seems to like poetry, I commend to him and to the administration of which he is part, the following lines:

“Whoso speaks in your presence must say acceptable things;
Bowing the head in worship, bending the knee in fear—
Bringing the word well smoothen—such as a king should hear.

* * * * *
Given to strong delusion, wholly believing a lie,
Ye saw the land lay ‘fenceless, and ye let the months go by,
Waiting some easy wonder; hoping some saying sign—
Idle—openly idle—in the lee of the forespent line.”

Very truly, yours,

THEODORE ROOSEVELT.

HON. MILES POINDEXTER,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

APPENDIX A.

PUT THE BLAME WHERE IT BELONGS.

[By the Editor.]

In order to carry on the war we have had to stop working. This paradoxical situation has been brought about by that same master of paradox who once suggested that we might be too proud to fight and since then has recommended universal voluntary service and peace without victory. We have this much to be thankful for—that the workless days ordered by Mr. Wilson's Fuel Administrator have aroused the country at last to some sort of visualization of the true state of affairs. This situation has brought us shame and humiliation; it has also caused new searchings of heart. The press and the Nation have suddenly discovered that their idol has feet of clay. In the roar of indignation that greeted Mr. Garfield's novel plan for speeding up the war, we missed the customary note of adulation which hitherto has predominated whenever the President or the President's pet ministers were involved. Is the country really beginning to lose its faith in the master of rhetoric who has so long held the people spellbound? Is it possible that some blame will attach itself to Mr. Wilson for the ghastly mess which his administration has made of the war? If such a thing were to happen it would not encourage us overmuch to believe that the country has at last come to its senses. For it would not mean in the very least that the people had reached the point of putting the blame where it really belongs. All we see in the waves of rage now beating upon the officials of Mr. Wilson's Cabinet or his various kinds of dictators is the melancholy fact that you can only get this great democracy to interest itself in its Government when the pockets and profits of the individual are touched or endangered.

What happened when Mr. Garfield stopped the wheels of industry? First of all a shriek of indignation went up from the country, and especially from the newspapers. Every paper in our vicinity published a protest to the President, signed by a representative of the New York World. Next came a resolution of the Senate to prevent the signing of the obnoxious order. Did anyone stop to consider whether the order was necessary or not? Did Mr. Don Seitz, of the New York World, suggest any other better method of clearing up the fatal congestion and getting coal to the ships in our harbors, so that the ships could sail and the war might not come to a standstill for lack of supplies? Did the Senate offer a better plan? No. The country, the press, and Congress waited until the administration had made about every error that any administration could make, until the paralysis of our transportation system was worse than any one could conceive of outside of darkest Russia, and then, when our precious fuel dictator, who was partly responsible for the appalling conditions, suddenly threw up his hands, and did what was perhaps the only thing that could possibly avert complete disaster, everyone, newspaper editors, business men, and Members of Congress, yelled their loudest that the order was a crime and must not be carried out. It is exactly as if a householder, having by carelessness allowed his house to get on fire, should implore the fire department not to spout water over his best furniture.

What is needed in such a humiliating and dangerous crisis is not hysterics, but a little clear thinking and self-sacrifice and determination. First of all the clear thinking. Let us try, if we possibly can, to put an end to the school-girlish gush and sickening idolatry which has surrounded the White House ever since Mr. Wilson entered its doors. Under our form of government, Mr. Wilson is entirely responsible and solely responsible for the choice of his Cabinet and for the

selection of administrative officers outside of the Cabinet. In no other country in the world, certainly not in Germany or in England or in France, is there a chief executive with so much power, power almost amounting to real dictatorship. For the lamentable failures of the present administration, therefore, Mr. Wilson and Mr. Wilson alone is responsible. Therefore we may expect sooner or later that in spite of all the idolatry of the past Mr. Wilson will come in for a large share of the blame. There exactly lies the weakness of popular ways of thinking. Mr. Wilson is, of course, to blame. It was he who appointed Mr. Garfield Fuel Administrator, knowing well that Mr. Garfield had no knowledge of coal mining or coal distribution, and no executive experience whatsoever. It was Mr. Wilson who allowed the railroads to entangle themselves in the meshes of priority orders and old-time competitive methods, when it was apparent that the transportation of the country must be under Government control. It was he who appointed one man after another to the Shipping Board who knew nothing about ships. It was he who made a pacifist Secretary of War. We need not enumerate at length the errors of choice which have resulted in a ministry of all the incompetents. Of course, the President is to blame. But that is only a superficial view of the matter. We, the people, are infinitely more culpable. After all, Mr. Wilson is doing what his nature and accomplishments permit him to do. He is trying his best to be a good war President. But we—this is a majority of the electorate and not an editorial "we"—made the unpardonable mistake of electing Mr. Wilson President. There lies the real blame.

Perhaps it may be said that we, too, in electing Mr. Wilson acted for what we believed to be the best. Let us not lay that flattering unction to our souls. We acted as a people, according to our worst instincts. The majority of the people elected Mr. Wilson because he had kept us out of war, because he had placed us in a position where we could make the most enormous profits out of the war. We voted for him because he was neutral about the ruin of Belgium and because he was worse than neutral about the sinking of the *Lusitania* just in so far as straightforward selfishness is better than a pretence of high-mindedness. If most of the people who supported Mr. Wilson had entertained any real expectation that he would go to war under any provocation whatsoever they would have elected him with the gravest misgivings. They knew what they had to expect. Mr. Wilson went to the White House in 1913 with a program of tariff reform and trust-busting. Old-fashioned, cut-throat competition was his slogan. In the year and a half of his first administration that preceded the war, his antiquated policy had done much to ruin the recovering prosperity of the country. Business was at a low ebb, the railroads were failing to meet their obligations right and left, there had been defaults to the tune of half a billion dollars' worth of railroad bonds; and worse was to come. Mr. Wilson's administration was saved only by the fortuitous circumstance of the war and the evil prosperity reaped out of the war. As an administrator and as a director of the Nation's policy he had been a failure. But he was still able to go to the country on a bogus wave of prosperity.

If, however, Mr. Wilson's peace record was bad, his war record was infinitely worse. At the outbreak of war he not only declared neutrality, but he denounced preparedness. He relied on what he pretended the American public to be, "a citizenry trained to arms," though he and everyone else knew it was a citizenry entirely untrained to arms. From that time on he espoused unpreparedness, though he was finally induced to make speeches about preparedness. He discharged the only man in his cabinet who cared a little about deeds rather than words in the matter of military preparation, and he put a pacifist in his place. And all the time the shadow of war was creeping closer and closer. When the election of 1916 came to pass the people of the United States had every reason to know that Mr. Wilson was neither a peace nor a war executive. His extraordinary inability to act had been demonstrated a multitude of times, but especially in his dealings with Mexico, where he was forever putting in a hesitating foot only to draw it out again. The people knew all about Mr. Wilson. Then why did they elect him President a second time? Partly because the political wirepullers deprived the opposition of the only real and obvious leadership that could safely defeat Mr. Wilson; but still more because our democracy is not by any means as great-minded as it pretends to be. Selfishness, profiteering, lack of foresight, lack of courage, an extraordinarily short-sighted materialism were apparent in the support of the President who had kept us out of war. Ordinary hard-headed business selfishness would have been better than the softness and the hatred of facing great sacrifices which were evident in 1916. Mere business selfishness would have compelled memory of Mr. Wilson's first two years and have demanded a more businesslike Executive. It is impossible to think too badly of the motives which dictated Mr. Wilson's second victory. In the future we shall look back on that period—even now we are beginning to look back on it—with grief and humiliation. Never, perhaps, was the national character more obfuscated by gross desires. And so when we see Mr. So-and-So, of the New York World or of any other paper that supported Mr. Wilson in 1916, issuing angry and frightened protests about some order of Mr. Wilson's Fuel Administrator that happens to hit the newspaper proprietor's pocket-book we are inclined to feel a little nauseated. No paper worked harder to elect Mr. Wilson than the World, and none has been more sycophantic in its attitude to the President up to the time the World feared to suffer individual loss. And we are sorry to say that a fairly large section of the public acts just like the New York World. Having voted for Mr. Wilson in order to be allowed to go on profiting by the war, and having hedged Mr. Wilson round with a sanctity that few monarchs and fewer salutes have ever enjoyed, they now are beginning to look for some one to blame because they possibly have not enough coal to keep them warm or sugar to sweeten their coffee. We have perhaps reached the worst period of disorganization that so great a country can reach. The warring nations outside of Russia have in all their three and a half years of bitter struggle suffered no such breakdown of their functions as we are now suffering. Things should get better; possibly they will get worse. But our only hope of real and permanent improvement is, first, that the Nation should realize its own culpability and put the blame where it belongs—on its own shoulders. For the Nation elected Mr. Wilson with its eyes open.

Second, that everyone, even if he is a Democrat, should cease to be an idolator and stop talking as if to criticize the administration were blasphemy. No one in England thinks he is aiding the enemy simply because he ventures to suggest that Lloyd-George might possibly be mistaken. Look at Lord Northcliffe's utterances. It is a positive fact that if any American newspapers said about Mr. Wilson what the Times and Daily Mail have said about Lloyd-George and Asquith Mr. Burleson would refuse to pass them through the mail. Third, let us end the parrot cry of "Stand by the President," and let us resolve to stand by the President with all our strength when the President stands by the honor of the country and enables the country to do what

it is longing to do, namely, to fight Germany. When the President is willing to appoint an efficient war Cabinet and choose men to handle affairs because they know their job, and not because they don't know it, he will easily compel the support of every patriotic man and woman in the country. There will be no need then for us to keep adjuring each other to stand by the President.

APPENDIX B. LINCOLN AND FREE SPEECH.

[By Theodore Roosevelt.]

Patriotism means to stand by the country. It does not mean to stand by the President or any other public official save exactly to the degree in which he himself stands by the country. It is patriotic to support him in so far as he efficiently serves the country. It is unpatriotic not to oppose him to the exact extent that by inefficiency or otherwise he fails in his duty to stand by the country. In either event, it is unpatriotic not to tell the truth—whether about the President or about anyone else—save in the rare cases where this would make known to the enemy information of military value which would otherwise be unknown to him.

Sedition, in the legal sense, means to betray the Government, to give aid and comfort to the enemy, or to counsel resistance to the laws or to measures of government having the force of law. There can be conduct morally as bad as legal sedition which yet may not be violation of law. The President—any President—can by speech or action (by advocating an improper peace or improper submission to national wrong) give aid and comfort to the public enemy as no one else in the land can do, and yet his conduct, however damaging to the country, is not seditious; and although if public sentiment is sufficiently aroused he can be impeached, such course is practically impossible.

One form of servility consists in a slavish attitude—of the kind incompatible with self-respecting manliness—toward any person who is powerful by reason of his office or position. Servility may be shown by a public servant toward the profiteering head of a large corporation, or toward the anti-American head of a big labor organization. It may also be shown in peculiarly noxious and un-American form by confounding the President or any other official with the country and shrieking "stand by the President," without regard to whether, by so acting, we do or do not stand by the country.

A distinguished Federal Judge recently wrote me as follows:

"Last November it seemed as if the American people were going to be converted into a hallelujah chorus, whose only function in government should be to shout 'Hallelujah!' 'Hallelujah!' for everything that the administration did or failed to do. Anyone who did not join that chorus was liable to imprisonment for treason or sedition."

"I hope that we shall soon have recovered our sense as well as our liberty."

"The authors of the first amendment to the Federal Constitution guaranteeing the right of assembly and of freedom of speech and of the press did not thus safeguard those rights for the sake alone of persons who were to enjoy them, but even more because they knew that the Republic which they were founding could not be worked on any other basis. Since Marshall tried Burr for treason it has been clear that that crime can not be committed by words, unless one acts as a spy, or gives advice to the enemy of military or naval operations. It can not be committed by statements reflecting upon officers or measures of government."

"Sedition is different. Anyone who directly advises or counsels resistance to measures of government is guilty of sedition. That, however, ought to be clearly distinguished from discussion of the wisdom or folly of measures of government, or the honesty or competency of public officers. That is not sedition. It is within the protection of the first amendment. The electorate can not be qualified to perform its duty in removing incompetent officers and securing the repeal of unwise laws unless those questions may be freely discussed."

"The right to say wise things necessarily implies the right to say foolish things. The answer to foolish speech is wise speech and not force. The Republic is founded upon the faith that if the American people are permitted freely to hear foolish and wise speech a majority will choose the wise. If that faith is not justified the Republic is based on sand. John Milton said it all in his defense of freedom of the press: 'Let truth and error grapple. Who ever knew truth to be beaten in a fair fight?'"

Abraham Lincoln was in Congress while Polk was President, during the Mexican War. The following extracts from his speeches, during war time, about the then President ought to be illuminating to those persons who do not understand that one of the highest and most patriotic duties to be performed in this country at this time is to tell the truth whenever it becomes necessary in order to force our Government to speed up the war. It would, for example, be our highest duty to tell it if at any time we became convinced that only thereby could we shame our leaders out of hypocrisy and prevent the betrayal of human rights by peace talk of the kind which bewilders and deceives plain people.

These quotations can be found on pages 100 to 146 of volume 1 of Lincoln's Complete Works, by Nicolay and Hay.

In a speech on January 12, 1848, Lincoln justified himself for voting in favor of a resolution censuring the President for his action prior to and during the war (which was still going on). He examines the President's official message of justification and says "that, taking for true all the President states as facts, he falls far short of proving his justification, and that the President would have gone further with his proof if it had not been for the small matter that the truth would not permit him." He says that part of the message "is from beginning to end the sheerest deception." He then asks the President to answer certain questions, and says, "Let him answer fully, fairly, and candidly. Let him answer with facts and not with arguments. Let him remember that he sits where Washington sat, and so remembering, let him answer as Washington would answer. Let him attempt no evasion, no equivocation." In other words, Lincoln says that he does not wish rhetoric or fine phrases or glittering statements that contradict one another and each of which has to be explained with a separate key or adroit and subtle special pleading and constant reversal of positions previously held, but straightforward and consistent adherence to the truth. He continues that he "more than suspects" that the President "is deeply conscious of being in the wrong; that he feels that" "innocent blood" "is crying to heaven against him"; "that one of the best generals had 'been driven into disfavor, if not disgrace, by the President' for insisting upon speaking unpalatable truths about the length of time the war would take (and therefore the need of full prepared-

ness); and ends by saying that the Army has done admirably, but that the President has bungled his work and "knows not where he is. He is a bewildered, confounded, and miserably perplexed man. God grant he may be able to show there is not something about his conscience more painful than all his mental perplexity."

Remember that this is Lincoln speaking, in war time, of the President. The general verdict of history has justified him. But it is impossible to justify him and not heartily to condemn the persons who in our time endeavor to suppress truth telling of a far less emphatic type than Lincoln's.

Lincoln had to deal with various critics of the "stand by the President" type. To one he answers that "the only alternative is to tell the truth or to lie," and that he would not "skulk" on such a question. He explains that the President's supporters "are untiring in their efforts to make the impression that all who vote supplies or take part in the war do of necessity approve the President's conduct," but that he (Lincoln) and his associates sharply distinguished between the two and voted supplies and men but "denounced the President's conduct" and "condemned the administration." He stated that to give the President the power demanded for him by certain people would "place the President where kings have always stood." In touching on what we should now speak of as rhetoric, he says, "The honest laborer digs coal at about 70 cents a day, while the President digs abstractions at about \$70 a day. The coal is clearly worth more than the abstractions, and yet what a monstrous inequality in the price!" He emphatically protests against permitting the President "to take the whole of legislation into his hands"—surely a statement applying exactly to the present situation. To the President's servile party supporters he makes a distinction which also readily applies at the present day, "The distinction between the cause of the President * * * and the cause of the country * * * you can not perceive. To you the President and the country seem to be all one. * * * We see the distinction clearly enough."

This last statement was the crux of the matter then and is the crux of the matter now. We hold that our loyalty is due solely to the American Republic, and to all our public servants exactly in proportion as they efficiently and faithfully serve the Republic. Our opponents, in flat contradiction of Lincoln's position, hold that our loyalty is due to the President, not the country; to one man, the servant of the people, instead of to the people themselves. In practice they adopt the fetishism of all believers in absolutism, for every man who parrots the cry of "stand by the President" without adding the proviso "so far as he serves the Republic" takes an attitude as essentially unmanly as that of any Stuart royalist who championed the doctrine that the king could do no wrong. No self-respecting and intelligent freeman can take such an attitude.

The Wisconsin Legislature has just set forth the proper American doctrine, as follows:

"The people of the State of Wisconsin always have stood and always will stand squarely behind the National Government in all things which are essential to bring the present war to a successful end, and we condemn Senator ROBERT LA FOLLETTE and all others who have failed to see the righteousness of our Nation's cause, who have failed to support our Government in matters vital to the winning of the war, and we denounce any attitude or utterance of theirs which has tended to incite sedition among the people of our country."

In view of the recent attitude of the administration as expressed through the Attorney General and Postmaster General, commend to its attention the utterances of Abraham Lincoln in 1848 and of the Wisconsin Legislature in 1918. The administration's warfare against German spies and American traitors has been feeble. The Government has achieved far less in this direction than has been achieved by, for instance, a private individual, John Rathom, of the Providence Journal. This failure is aggravated by such action as was threatened against the Metropolitan Magazine. The Metropolitan—and the present writer—have stood, and will continue to stand, "squarely behind the National Government in all things which are essential to bring the present war to a successful end" and to support "the righteousness of the Nation's cause." We will stand behind the country at every point, and we will at every point either support or oppose the administration precisely in proportion as it does or does not with efficiency and single-minded devotion serve the country.

From this position we will not be driven by any abuse of power or by any effort to make us not the loyal servants of the American people, but the cringing tools of a man who at the moment has power.

The administration has in some of its actions on vital points shown great inefficiency (as proved by Senator CHAMBERLAIN's committee), and on other points has been guilty of conduct toward certain peoples wholly inconsistent with its public professions as regards all international conduct. It can not meet these accusations, for they are truthful, and to try to suppress the truth by preventing the circulation of the Metropolitan Magazine is as high-handed a defiance of liberty and justice as anything done by the Hohenzollerns or the Romanoffs. Such action is intolerable. Contrast the leniency shown by the Government toward the grossest offenses against the Nation with its eagerness to assail anyone who tells unpleasant truths about the administration. The Hearst papers play the German game when they oppose the war, assail our allies, and clamor for an inconclusive peace, and they play the German game when they assail the men who truthfully point out the shortcomings which, unless corrected, will redound to Germany's advantage and our terrible disadvantage. But the administration has taken no action against the Hearst papers. The Metropolitan Magazine has supported the war, has championed every measure to speed up the war and to make our strength effective, and has stood against every proposal for a peace without victory. But the administration acts against the magazine that in straightforward, American fashion has championed the war. Such discrimination is not compatible with either honesty or patriotism. It means that the administration is using the great power of the Government to punish honest criticism of its shortcomings, while it accepts support of and apology for these shortcomings as an offset to action against the war and, therefore, against the Nation. Conduct of this kind is a grave abuse of official power.

Whatever the administration does, I shall continue to act in the future precisely as I have acted in the past. When a Senator like Mr. CHAMBERLAIN in some great matter serves the country better than does the administration, I shall support that Senator; and when a Senator like Mr. LA FOLLETTE perseveres in the course followed by the administration before it reversed itself in February, 1917, I shall oppose him and to that extent support the administration in its present position. I shall continue to support the administration in every such action as floating the liberty loans, raising the draft army, or sending our troops abroad. I shall continue truthfully to criticize any flagrant

acts of incompetency by the administration, such as the failure in shipping matters and the breakdown of the War Department during the last 14 months, when it appears that such truthful criticism offers the only chance of remedying the wrong. I shall support every official from the President down who does well, and shall oppose every such official who does ill. I shall not put the personal comfort of the President or of any other public servant above the welfare of the country.

I contemptuously refuse to recognize any American adaptation of the German doctrine of *lèse majesté*. I am concerned only with the welfare of my beloved country and with the effort to beat down the German horror in the interest of the orderly freedom of all the nations of mankind. If the administration does the work of war with all possible speed and efficiency, and stands for preparedness as a permanent policy, and heartily supports our allies to the end, and insists upon complete victory as a basis for peace, I shall heartily support it. If the administration moves in the direction of an improper peace, of the peace of defeat and of cowardice, or if it wages war feebly and timidly, I shall oppose it and shall endeavor to wake the American people to their danger.

I hold that only in this way can I act as patriotism bids me act. I hold that only in this way can I serve in even the slightest degree the cause of America, of the allies, and of liberty; and that only thus can I aid in thwarting Germany's effort to establish a world tyranny.

APPENDIX C.

The Metropolitan, in February, 1912, in "The Kaiser in American policies," by E. Cunliffe-Owen, exposed the German-American Alliance, (German frightfulness took thousands of dollars of advertising out of the pages of the Metropolitan for this.)

The Metropolitan, in October, 1914, in an editorial "The lesson," by H. J. Whigham, began its campaign for preparedness two months after the invasion of Belgium. (This was months before the submarine menace.)

The Metropolitan, in March, 1915, urged universal service in an article by Theodore Roosevelt, "The need of preparedness." (It wasn't the popular thing to do at the time, but it was right then as it is now.)

The Metropolitan, in October, 1915, called for fleets of airplanes in an article by Richard Harding Davis, "Our eagle without wings." (The American Army had 12 airplanes at this time.)

The Metropolitan in a keynote editorial, "Murder on the high seas," by Theodore Roosevelt, was for America's active participation in the war following the sinking of the *Lusitania*. (This was the heyday of German activities in America.)

The Metropolitan, on May 8, 1917, in "Put the flag on the firing line," by Theodore Roosevelt, advocated sending American troops to France immediately. (On April 13 Secretary of War Baker stated that "our policy at first (would be) to devote all our energies to raising troops in sufficient numbers to exert a substantial influence in a later stage of the war.")

In brief, this is the war record of the Metropolitan, which won from Secretary of War Baker, with whom it has not always agreed, the indorsement made before Congress as the magazine that has stood for preparedness and was expressive "of those who were most anxious for rapid progress."

This fighting magazine is your magazine. Its power of influence is in your hands; the hands of over 2,000,000 straight-thinking American men and women, who read it every month. This influence should not stop with a circle of over 2,000,000 readers, great as that is. The way to increase it is to talk the Metropolitan to your friends. Ask them, "Did you read Roosevelt's article in the Metropolitan this month?" "Do you know what William Hard is fighting for in the Metropolitan?" "Did you see that editorial on page 5 of the May Metropolitan?" If you want to go further than this, send our circulation manager the names and addresses of your friends who are not now reading the Metropolitan and who should be reading it. Every day seems to make clearer the fact that the decision for an honorable and lasting peace rests with America, and America must hurry. When you increase the influence of the Metropolitan, you are putting your back into the war and hastening to its consummation the peace that will mean a safe world to live in.

APPENDIX D.

No thoughtful American can ignore the portentous possibilities of the campaign of disloyalty and sedition that has been pursued in her midst since the very war began. That campaign was never more active and never more dangerous than it is at this hour.

In that campaign there are many contributing factors. The honest pacifists number thousands, and for their error of judgment we can only have pity, and as to them it may be true, as Jefferson said more than a century ago, that "error can be tolerated as long as reason is left free to combat it." The same is true of the honest Socialists, whose Utopian dream of a community of property and of the possibility of fraternal anarchy, and whose delusion that this great war has been brought about by the capitalistic classes, can only be combated by argument. In the case of the honest dissenter, little, if anything, will be gained by repression. The doctrinaire thrives on repression.

We are to-night concerned with the efforts of pro-German sympathizers to weaken the purpose and sap the morale of the American people by a hasty pacifism.

This serpent must not only be "scotched" but stamped out altogether if America is to be worthy of its great destiny.

The source and inspiration of this spirit is not far to seek. We need not concern ourselves with its minor rivulets and eddies. We must go to the fountain head itself and dam up its pernicious influences.

Its chief source is to be found in the journalistic enterprises of one man, and his name is William Randolph Hearst. His power for evil is immeasurable. He is said to own 17 newspapers and magazines, and as he controls the policy of papers in Boston, New York, Atlanta, Chicago, San Francisco, and Los Angeles the daily influence that he exerts is Nation-wide. No single influence is comparable with the Hearst influence in its potency for evil. His leading organ in this city claims a circulation of 450,000 copies, and if so it is altogether probable that it is daily read by a million people in the section to which it is tributary. His adherents do not greatly exaggerate when they claim for Mr. Hearst a daily audience of 5,000,000 of people. It is thus within Mr. Hearst's power to convey to these millions the subtle poison of insidiously disloyal utterances, and it may be said without exaggeration that the greatest menace to the part which American is destined to play in the struggle comes from the Hearst press.

I shall not impugn Mr. Hearst's motives, except to say that from the time he first became the owner of a great newspaper he has systemat-

ically endeavored to appeal to class passion, and to lash the ocean of public opinion into angry waves of class passion.

I do not pretend to know whether his ambition is to rise to power on the crest of these waves or whether he is satisfied, like Mark Anthony in his speech to the Roman mob, to say, "now, mischief, thou art afoot, take thou what course thou wilt." It is possible that his pro-German sympathies are matters of honest conviction, and that he may believe in good faith that the interests of America are best subserved by a sympathetic attitude toward Germany.

Whatever his motives and purposes may be, the inevitable result of his consistent policy as an editor and journalist is to widen the breach between classes in this country, to increase popular discontent, and to weaken the arm of the Government in defending the rights of the American people.

While fairness requires us to recognize that Mr. Hearst can not have personal previous knowledge of all that his editors write, yet he is legally and morally responsible for the consistent editorial policies of his newspapers.

At the beginning of the world war a Hearst journal expressed sympathy with the cause of Germany, even justifying its treacherous assault upon civilization by the assertion that Germany's economic needs could not be satisfied by a "peaceful German expansion in Europe." The defeat of Germany meant "the destruction of the most progressive nation in Europe"; and on another occasion one of his editors said that the issue of the war was "whether the luminous German thought should be victorious or not in Europe." That "luminous" thought is seen in the flames at Louvain and Rheims.

His organs opposed the arming of our merchant vessels when they were attacked in defiance of international law by the ruthless submarine and demanded a popular referendum before congressional authority was given to the merchant marine of America to defend itself against piratical attacks.

His papers deprecated the immemorial rights of Americans to travel on the high seas as the common pathway of nations, and the Journal was "wholly opposed to the policy of making the death of any American who knowingly takes such a foolhardy risk a cause of bloody and ruinous war." Even after the channel steamer, the *Sussex*, was destroyed, and our women and children perished beneath the waves, his organs said "that the undoubted will of the American people is that Congress should maintain peace." The practical sympathy that he thus withheld from American women and children who were sacrificed in the dastardly sinking of the *Lusitania* was given to the contention of the Government which sent out the submarines to destroy noncombatants, for one of his organs said editorially: "Particularly do we deplore the sentiment which has been fostered against the submarine. * * * We are making a terrible mistake in this sentimental objection to submarine warfare."

Hearstism pushed its defense of the submarine to the ridiculous extreme of suggesting that the immense loss of life which followed the sinking of the *Lusitania* was due "to the incompetency of the *Lusitania* crew."

Hearstism proceeded to play upon the innate chivalry of the American people by inviting them to be sympathetic, "with poor, bleeding, suffering Germany"; but when that extraordinary appeal met with no response, it attempted to play upon the supposed cowardice of the American people by suggesting that Germany was unconquerable, and that it would simply be a needless waste of our treasure and blood to defend our rights upon the high seas. As late as July 27, 1917, after America had suffered outrages beyond recorded precedent, and our President and Congress had declared war to vindicate the rights of our people, Mr. Hearst, in a signed letter, demanded an immediate peace rather than send "a million of our splendid young Americans every year for a war to be offered up in bloody sacrifice."

His appeals could not be regarded as founded upon any honest pacifism; for while he invoked us to be neutral rather than inflict injury upon "poor, bleeding, suffering Germany," he advocated the assertion of our rights against England to the very limit, and not only urged war upon distracted and bleeding Mexico, but attempted to foment suspicion and enmity between Japan and the United States.

When, despite his vociferous imprecations and appeals, the United States finally took up the gauge of battle that had so often been arrogantly thrown at its feet, the great camouflage at first affected to support his Government with ungrudging loyalty, but in a short time advised a course of extraordinary selfishness and cowardice. From day to day he insistently urged that "we should keep our own men and money at home for effective defense." He supported this conclusion by the extraordinary arguments that as America would surely win any war in which it had entered, that our active intervention would only result in "prolonging it." His organ added: "If we stayed out of the war—assuming that we could, honorably—that would mean shortening the war." As this argument did not appeal to Americans with red blood in their veins, Hearstism next reached the somewhat contradictory conclusion that Germany was unconquerable, for his organs suggested that "one must first of all recall to one's mind that by declaring war on Germany we act directly in favor of German militarism and make the defeat of the allies as sure as sure can be"; and he again urged that "we should keep our men and our money in this country."

His organs contended that even food should be withheld from the European nations, adding "that every shipment of food and military supplies from this time on is a blow at our own safety," and for this reason Hearstism urged Congress "to refuse to permit the further drainage of our food, supplies, military and money supplies to Europe." To him the only sensible course for this country was to desert our allies, by keeping "every dollar and every man and every weapon, and all our supplies and stores at home for the defense of our own land * * * until that defense is made absolutely secure." Two years were suggested as the limit of time to make our country secure, and thus the cowardly suggestion was made that our country should for two years leave our allies to fight our battle for us, as they had already done for nearly three preceding years.

When these arguments did not impress the American people, Hearstism then proceeded to argue for an early and a separate peace. As no policy could be more destructive of the morale of the American people, I beg your indulgence while I fortify my statement by three leading articles, which have recently appeared in Mr. Hearst's leading organ, the New York American. They represent the very essence of his present policy of cowardice and dishonor, and, having regard to the immense audience to which these words were addressed, numbering millions of our people in all sections of our country, the danger of this subtle poison is unmistakable.

The occasion which had called forth these three articles was the reply which the central powers had made to the recent note of the Vatican. The Pope had issued a peace note, which virtually suggested

the same termination to the war as had followed the "Seven Years' War," namely, a return to the status quo ante. To this the German Chancellor had replied with a disingenuous note, which promised nothing whatever that was tangible, but which had the amazing effrontery to suggest to His Holiness that Germany greeted with especial sympathy the Pope's statement that "in the future the material power of arms must be superseded by the moral power of right." This from a nation which had encouraged the 48-hour ultimatum to Serbia and had refused to entertain any pacific suggestion to determine what remained of the Serbian controversy by the processes of reason, was a piece of colossal hypocrisy, which would have caused a Tartuffe or a Pecksniff to hide his diminished head.

To Hearst this trifling consideration as to the possible sincerity of Germany in now favoring a peace by negotiation with a view to the limitation of armies and navies was a matter of little importance. To him Germany's oral assent to a principle, which for three years it has steadily denied, and against which its whole career as a nation from the time of Frederick the Great was a consistent negative, was sufficient to terminate the struggle, and require the United States to make an immediate peace, even though in so doing it deserted its allies. He even had the supreme effrontery to claim that in this view he expressed the attitude of the President of the United States. On September 21, 1917, in a full page editorial, Mr. Hearst claimed that the inspired view of the administration was as follows:

"If after Germany has recognized the fair and honorable terms of the United States any other nation or group of nations desires to despoil Germany of territories and indemnities, the United States will not only refuse to aid such proceedings, but will feel in honor bound to call a halt upon them, and to demand peremptorily that Germany shall not be robbed by others because of a victory obtained through the United States."

Stripped of its verbal camouflage, this means that if Germany were willing to surrender the occupied portions of Belgium and northern France, she should be entitled to receive back all her captured territory and not pay one single penny of indemnity to recoup the allied nations for their enormous expenditure of treasure and blood, or even to repair the infinite damage so ruthlessly done in occupied territory. As Germany had taken from Belgium alone \$500,000,000 worth of movable property while blackmailing other nations into supporting the civil population, the effect of this proposal of "no indemnities" would necessarily be that Germany would receive an indemnity of the amount of the property that she had so cruelly stolen from the civilians of Belgium, Poland, Russia, Serbia, Roumania, and France, an amount not now susceptible of computation, but probably exceeding \$1,000,000,000.

It was then suggested that if Great Britain, France, and Belgium were unwilling to end this war without receiving some reparation for their infinite losses, that the United States was in that event "in honor bound to call a halt upon them," and I know of no effective way in which the United States could thus "call a halt" upon the allies in their legitimate effort to secure justice than by making war upon them. The policy of no indemnities would indirectly give Germany an indemnity in stolen property equaling that wrung from bleeding France in 1871.

To support this monstrous contention, so gratuitously and unjustly attributed to the President, Mr. Hearst proceeds to make the point that England, France, Italy, and Russia "are not our allies," and that "no one has any right to speak of these nations as our allies." He proceeds to state that the distinction between "associates" and "allies" is neither slight nor merely verbal.

I will not enter into any discussion as to the propriety of the word "allies," except to say that an alliance is something more than a piece of parchment with a red seal. It is a fact. It would surprise our brave soldiers in the trenches if they were to be told that the brave French poilus in the same trench were not allies. For myself, the word "ally," if it have any weakness, is that it does not fully express the relation which in the comradeship of blood now binds us to the allied nations. To the eye of imagination there is something more than an alliance created by the present community of the free nations of the world in their common fight against military despotism.

While our soldiers fight shoulder to shoulder in the trenches; while our women behind the lines give to the common cause the very treasures of their souls; while our armies march together, and our statesmen assemble the common resources; while our flags are intertwined, there is created, for the purposes of this war and while it lasts, a new governmental unit. The peoples of the allied nations are therefore not merely allies, but in a sense fellow citizens. "A single front, a single army, a single nation—that is the program for future victory," as the French foreign minister, Poincaré, recently said, and to this Lloyd-George replied: "If after 40 months of war, after all the lessons the war has taught us, the allies are not capable of that sacred international union, then in spite of their sacrifices they would not be worthy of victory." Stern and true words, but to Mr. Hearst America is only an "associate" and can desert its allies at will, when its own selfish ends are attained. We are more than allies, for the true bond of the comradeship of blood was never better stated than by Shakespeare when he put into the mouth of his Henry V, on the eve of Agincourt:

* * * * *
We hand of brothers,
For he who sheds his blood this day with me,
He is my brother."

Brothers we are, and, please God, brothers we shall remain, and all the powers of Hearst and Hell will not prevail against that sacred union.

In this editorial, printed less than two months ago, Mr. Hearst then proceeds to give a gloss to the doctrine, which he has had the hardihood to impute to the President. I say this advisedly, for when I had the privilege some weeks ago to present a gathering of representative Americans to the President he impressed us that, whatever his previous views may have been, his present and unchangeable purpose is to continue this war until the demands of justice are fully satisfied.

Let us concede for the moment, although such is not my idea of our national interest or duty, that the United States would be justified, if Germany desisted from its submarine campaign, to make a separate peace and withdraw from the alliance; but upon what possible ground of either human or divine law could the United States say to Great Britain or France, if they cared to proceed to fight for other and greater demands of justice—peculiarly due to them because of their peculiar wrongs—that America would then become the ally of Germany, and proceed to attack them?

Having thus given a counsel of iniquitous cowardice, Mr. Hearst then proceeds to say that anyone who holds a contrary view is either a "war lunatic or a war profiteer," and he proceeds to emphasize the very dangerous doctrine, which, if anything, would sap the morale of

American people, that this war is desired by "war profiteers." Those who would not be willing that America should betray the cause of the allies are in this editorial characterized as the—

"ready, willing, subservient lick-spittle tools and agents of blood-sucking war profiteers and foreign governments and censorships, hungry and thirsty for American money and American blood."

On the following day Mr. Hearst renewed his efforts to drive a wedge between the allies. Each one of these editorials is headed by a scriptural quotation, for it was said of old that "the devil can cite Scripture for a purpose." The text which is selected for his leading editorial of September 22 was most apt. It was this: "He that tilleth his land shall have plenty of bread, but he that followeth after vain persons shall have poverty enough."

The text of this editorial was a statement by Mr. Bonar Law, in which the chancellor of the British exchequer took occasion to pay a generous tribute to the help that America had already given to the great alliance. He quotes Mr. Bonar Law as follows:

"We have two special reasons for satisfaction at the coming in of the United States: first, it is the best possible proof that our cause is just and righteous; and, second, we know we now have on our side resources which are more than sufficient to achieve victory."

Mr. Hearst then proceeds to twist Mr. Bonar Law's statement—

"that our resources are more than sufficient to achieve victory" into an altogether different statement, that Great Britain and France can not win without these resources, and he proceeds to argue that—"inasmuch as Mr. Bonar Law confesses that the allies were in disastrous straits six months ago, and were saved then by the United States, and still rely upon the United States for salvation from defeat, it is evident enough that our Government has the right and the power, too, to dictate the terms of peace, and the American people expect England and the other allied governments to recognize that right, and to accept the terms laid down by the President."

These terms are, as previously indicated, to accept Germany's hypocritical cry of "Kamerad!" and leave her go, not only "unwhipped of justice" but actually with much of her stolen booty still in her hands.

Consider for a moment the monstrous character of that suggestion of an American newspaper, which has daily a million readers. To tolerate without a protest such a base and sordid suggestion reflects upon every American. In effect, it says that after Great Britain and France had sacrificed more than a million of the lives of their brave sons for the cause of justice, and after they had, according to Mr. Hearst, bankrupted their resources to achieve the same great end—an end which meant our security as well as theirs—that because we have contributed out of our prosperity a part of our enormous resources, we have the right to dictate to our allies, not only that with which we will be satisfied, but that with which they must be satisfied. Such a course would make America the Judas Iscariot of nations, for we would thus betray the cause of justice for so many pieces of silver.

More than a million Frenchmen and Britons sleep the last sleep in the now forever sacred soil of France between the Channel and the Vosges. They died in the faith that they did not die in vain. While, like Moses, they would never be privileged to enter the promised land of a better civilization, yet they died in the belief that they had sacrificed their lives to establish justice in civilization. A peace that would betray in any degree the great cause for which they died would be a betrayal of the dead. It would crucify the cause of justice afresh and put it to an open shame.

Such is undoubtedly the feeling of those in England and France who survive and who have lost forever the fathers, husbands, and sons, who died for as holy a cause as man ever fought for; and yet Mr. Hearst has the baseness to suggest to a million and more of the American people that the mere treasure of dollars that we have contributed, be it little or great, gives us a right not only to desert them when our primary aims are satisfied, but even to rob them of the fruits of their victory and to compel them to be false to their sacred dead.

A more infamous suggestion has never been made in this war by anyone who calls himself an American; and yet Mr. Hearst, in the same editorial, insistently demands that the English Government—

"must recognize the terms of peace formulated by the President * * * and so must the war profiteers here at home, and the newspapers and politicians that are in the employ of the war profiteers or under their sordid influence."

To press home his base suggestion that this war is only desired by the capital class, this most dangerous and unscrupulous demagogue in the whole history of our country adds:

"It is time that * * * these Steel Trust and Powder Trust profiteers and their press, who are apparently eager to see this awful war continue until half the world is destroyed, provided they can make money out of their pretended patriotism, * * * are made to know that they must submit to the reasonable and sensible and humane policy of our Government, as expressed in the President's reply to Pope Benedict."

Again he refers to the "war profiteers" and the newspapers and agents that serve them as men who are "reaping extraordinary profits and fattening their bank accounts while others are suffering and dying and sacrificing their dearest and their all." It is just such seditious poison, injected into the souls of the ignorant and unwary, that has destroyed, at least for the time being, the mighty power of Russia and given its Government and people over to self-destructive anarchy. An idea is more potent than an army, but unfortunately this is true of an evil idea as well as a true one. The great and brave armies of Russia have been demoralized into impotence by a Lenin. Shall America's gathering armies be weakened by a Hearst?

Is any influence more calculated to sap the morale of our people and that of our soldiers? A very distinguished clergyman, known to most of you, who recently preached at one of our camps, recently told me that after his patriotic sermon had concluded he was amazed to have a number of soldiers ask him whether it was true that this war was carried on to profit "big business" in Wall Street. Will our soldiers acquit themselves as men if their minds and souls are thus poisoned? How can our soldiers do their full duty if their minds are poisoned by the suggestions that no cause remains to continue the war, and that its continuance is only due to "war profiteers," who seek to fatten their pocketbooks in the suffering of the Army and Navy? Similar suggestions destroyed the offensive force of Russia's mighty armies and made the streets of Petrograd run with blood. To me the most pitiable tragedy of the war has been the debacle of Cadorna's armies. For a year with unsurpassed martial courage in the rank and file and with a skill in leadership little undervalued to that with which Hannibal and Napoleon won the passages of the Alps, the Italian Army had driven a brave and numerous enemy from the greatest natural fortresses in

the world. Then followed the greatest disaster of the war, with its inevitable and serious menace to the prospects of the allied cause, due not to fair fighting, such as would have been worthy of the vaunted chivalry of Prussian militarism, but to the treachery of a portion of the Italian front, whose loyalty had been corrupted by the insidious poison of socialistic pacifism. What the enemy could not accomplish in fair and open battle had been accomplished by his covert propaganda. It is clear that Germany, defeated on the Marne, the Yser, and the Meuse, is now attempting to gain a decisive victory by sapping the morale of its enemies through a propaganda which masks itself under the name of "socialism."

Two days later Mr. Hearst went further in another full-page editorial in his leading organ, the American, falsely so called. He now claimed that the war had practically been won by Germany's reply to the Pope's proposal, and, to quote his words, America—

"without firing a shot in battle, the United States has won the greatest and most momentous victory ever won in the history of mankind."

This flamboyant flapdoodle referred to the disingenuous reply of the Imperial German Government to the Pope, in which Mr. Hearst finds "a sincere desire to negotiate peace upon the fundamental basis laid down by the United States," although Germany has never yet officially said that it would even vacate Belgium, much less make reparation. He then indorses the claim of Germany, to quote his own word—

"that England must lay aside her pretensions to rule the seas and reduce her gigantic naval armaments to limits"—

quite ignoring the fact that the navy of England has not only been her security in the last half century, but our own. Further ignoring the fact that the Imperial German Government three years ago contemptuously repudiated its solemn and oft-reiterated promise, even when reduced to writing and sealed with the red seal, as a "scrap of paper." Mr. Hearst proceeds to wax enthusiastic on Germany's assurance of its sympathy with the principle "that in the future the material power of arms must be superseded by the moral power of right," and upon this mere assertion of a Government which has wrapped the whole world in a universal flame and brought the greatest disaster upon mankind that recorded history has known Mr. Hearst accepts this vague promise as a clear acceptance of President Wilson's proposals and a full satisfaction of America's war aims.

We know that President Wilson did not so regard it, and those of us who differed with President Wilson before our country entered the war, can now express our great satisfaction with the dignity and power of his note to the Pope, and especially with his inspiring call to arms in his great war message of April 2, and his even more biting indictment of Germany's crimes in his great Flag Day speech. These utterances indicate that the President is wholeheartedly for a peace with victory and retributive justice.

Mr. Hearst, in this editorial of September 24, 1917, regards all things as adjusted, now that Germany has recognized the supremacy of the moral power of right to that of arms; and he thereupon proceeds to sap the morale of the American people by confusing its judgment and paralyzing its will, by this subtle suggestion:

"The attitude assumed by the central empires is a great triumph for President Wilson. It is clear that he will have little difficulty in negotiating a peace with Germany that will raise his personal prestige to an enormous height, that will meet the approval of the vast majority of his countrymen, and that will practically end militarism and make the world safe, indeed, for democracy. The delicate question now is whether the President can bring England around to the acceptance of a reasonable peace upon American terms, or whether that Government will stubbornly insist on a peace upon English terms."

Mark the attempt to drive a wedge between the United States and England! Mr. Hearst says nothing about France or Russia or Italy. The idea is that only England is the obstacle to peace. The insidious suggestion is that the President must now bring pressure upon England, presumably upon the same sordid ground previously stated that as we had contributed money to England, of which she was in desperate need, like Shylock, we could demand our pound of flesh.

That this is Mr. Hearst's idea is shown beyond question in the following significant and iniquitous sentence:

"It is not amiss to say here and now that the President holds all the cards in his own hands, that if he so decides he is fully able to make the allies, as well as Germany and Austria, consent to America's terms, and that if he does elect so to use his power and authority over the situation, as to end this war upon the terms he has himself formulated he will find the whole Nation at his back, ready to give him the men and the money to make good America's just and sensible terms of peace against any and all Governments that oppose them."

Mr. Hearst misreads the character of the American people. He also misreads the policy to which the President is irrevocably committed. If President Wilson were capable of the base betrayal of our allies, which Mr. Hearst now suggests, he would not find America behind him. America is now behind our President, because it believes in his wholehearted purpose to wage this war in loyal harmony with our allies until the common ends are fully attained. The man who thus in a leading editorial gravely teaches to millions of Americans that the President of the United States should betray the cause of our allies—now happily the cause of America—is a dangerous and disloyal demagogue.

How long, my fellow citizens, will this man be tolerated? The course of history is one of endless repetitions, and his type is not new to human experience. Two thousand years ago such a man lived in the dying days of the Roman Republic. He was a man of means and social standing, like Hearst—a member of the senate, which Hearst would probably like to be—and the leader of a powerful faction, which Mr. Hearst is. He appealed to the unfortunate and the discontented in order that with their aid he could rise to power. His name was Cataline, and it is a name forever infamous in history.

When he dared to enter the Senate those who sat next to him left their seats and avoided him as a common enemy, and it was then that the great Consul Cicero addressed to him as he sat there "naked and unashamed" the withering words that have come down the centuries:

"How far wilt thou, Cataline, abuse our patience? How far wilt thou carry thy unbridled audacity?"

I am not sure that in the example of the Roman Senate we do not find the only remedy for Hearstism. The processes of law are not sufficient. To maintain the guarantees of free speech and a free press we are obliged, at least in times of peace, to tolerate the baneful excesses of the demagogue; but there always remains a power above and without the law, the consuming power of public opinion, which can burn like fire and blast like lightning. It is true that enlightened public opinion has always condemned Hearstism without ending it, but public opinion is like the rays of the sun. Diffuse it and it does

not destroy; concentrate its rays in a magnifying glass and it will consume as fire. Public opinion should be concentrated on Hearst and Hearstism until both he and his organs are the scorn of all honest men as Cataline was when he sat alone in the Senate.

The times are critical and we can not afford to tolerate this fountain-head of demagoguery. Let every citizen awake to an obvious peril, for if the morale of the American people should be weakened by such poison, then the energy of our Government will necessarily decrease, for in a land of free men the Government is powerless unless sustained by a strong and puissant public opinion. In this lies the great peril of Hearstism.

The future of this war, the greatest that the world ever knew, both in its dimensions and in the vital issues which it involves, may, and probably does, depend upon America. Will America fail? If she fails now, she has failed the cause of democracy and civilization for centuries to come. From that supreme infidelity she may never fully recover. If she is true to her great past and worthily acquits herself in this supreme struggle for the right, then no limit can be set to her mighty future. Will we permit that future to be dimmed or defeated by Hearst or Hearstism?

We have many foes without our gates, but none so dangerous as those that are within. If America does not neglect this internal danger; if she have the courage and the capacity to strike down at the very beginning this poisonous serpent of internal dissension, then she will not fail her allies in the greatest and noblest task to which America ever addressed her mighty energies.

As Shakespeare made his Richmond say on the eve of the victory of Bosworth so let me conclude:

"In God's name, cheerily on, courageous friends,
To reap the harvest of perpetual peace,
By this one bloody trial of sharp war."

Mr. SWANSON subsequently said: Mr. President, the Senate has directed the printing in the RECORD of a statement of Col. Roosevelt regarding the controversy between himself and the Postmaster General. I ask unanimous consent that the statement of the Postmaster General, given out on the 19th of May, may also be printed in the RECORD, in a spirit of fair play and justice to the Postmaster General.

Mr. GALLINGER. What is it a reply to?

Mr. SWANSON. It relates to the controversy between Col. Roosevelt and the Postmaster General. A statement of Col. Roosevelt has been directed to be printed in the RECORD. I think, in a spirit of justice and fair play, the statement of the Postmaster General should also be included in the RECORD.

Mr. GALLINGER. Was the statement of Col. Roosevelt read when it went into the RECORD?

Mr. SWANSON. It was ordered printed in the RECORD, but not read. I do not ask the privilege of having this read, but simply that it be printed, along with the statement of Col. Roosevelt.

Mr. GALLINGER. Well, nobody will ever read it, so it will not do any harm.

The VICE PRESIDENT. In the absence of objection, the matter referred to will be printed in the RECORD.

The matter referred to is as follows:

MAY 19, 1918.

The Postmaster General to-day authorized the following statement: I have waited patiently for Mr. Roosevelt to substantiate his statement made in the morning papers of May 8 to the effect that the Post Office Department was using the espionage act for political purposes by "punishing papers which upheld the war, but which told the truth about the administration's failure to conduct the war efficiently," and by failing to "proceed against powerful newspapers which opposed the war or attacked our allies or directly or indirectly aided Germany against this country, as those papers upheld the administration and defended inefficiency."

Mr. Roosevelt's reply of May 11, which he then termed "preliminary," in the main evades the issue presented and is thoroughly misleading. He names the New York Tribune, Collier's, and the Metropolitan Magazine in a way which has created the impression that these publications have been the objects of improper discrimination by the Post Office Department.

This department has taken no action against Collier's.

This department has taken no action against the Tribune.

In exposing German propaganda early in the war the department brought to public attention typical seditious matter which was being circulated throughout the country. It made available to newspaper men its files disclosing such disloyal matter. The Tribune promptly availed itself of this opportunity and gave helpful assistance, for which patriotic service I personally thanked one of its staff correspondents.

The department has taken no action against the Metropolitan Magazine.

With respect to this magazine, the incident referred to by Mr. Roosevelt occurred after the magazine had passed through the mails and not a copy offered for mailing failed of transmission. The facts with respect to this matter were made public in a statement by the Solicitor, which appeared in the morning papers of March 10. Mr. Roosevelt's contention that the Metropolitan Magazine was injured from that incident is unfortunate. It can not be said that the magazine lost sales on that account at that time. On the contrary, more copies of the March issue were sold on account of the publicity given the matter. The injury, therefore, must have followed as a result of public disapproval of the matter contained in that issue. I have yet to learn of a patriotic reader, unless it be Mr. Roosevelt, who approved the publication in that issue of the article "Is America Honest?" by William Hard. This department received a large number of letters from widely separated sections of the country characterizing the publication of the "Hard" article as bad from every viewpoint. Some claimed it was unpatriotic, others that it violated the espionage act, and still others that it was treasonable.

If Mr. Roosevelt means that I should repair the injury (?) to the magazine by joining him in commending the "Hard" article as de-

sirable literature for forwarding the war aims of the Government, I can not accommodate him.

I am reliably informed that Germany highly appreciates the Hard article—so highly, in fact, that her propagandists have translated it into German, Spanish, Portuguese, and the Scandinavian languages and are now flooding Mexico, South America, and other countries with copies of it. Mr. Roosevelt could hardly add to the injurious effects of this article should he now have it reproduced in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in full, with its disgusting illustrations accompanied by his express approval, thus giving it free and unlimited distribution.

So much for Mr. Roosevelt's first charge. Now what of his second? The press of every complexion should always have the widest latitude for criticism of the acts of all public officials. This principle is constantly kept in mind in the administration of the espionage act and disposing of complaints made thereunder.

The Post Office Department has received possibly more complaints from the public alleging that Mr. Roosevelt's articles were in violation of the espionage act than it has against the Hearst newspapers. No matter published by either Mr. Roosevelt or Mr. Hearst has come to my attention which, in my opinion, warranted action by the Post Office Department under the espionage act against either of them.

All but two of the articles in the Hearst papers referred to by Mr. Roosevelt were published before the passage of the espionage act (June 15, 1917), and some of them before our entry into the war. The Post Office Department can hardly be expected even by Mr. Roosevelt to take action against a paper for the publication of matter which was printed and circulated before the passage of the law. The two articles specifically mentioned appeared in the New York American of July 27 and November 22, 1917. Mr. Roosevelt is not a lawyer, and however one may disagree with these two articles, it is confidently asserted that if Mr. Roosevelt had advised with a lawyer of even second-rate ability, he would have been told nothing could be found in these articles in violation of the espionage act.

Mr. Hearst, through his vast newspaper circulation and writing along lines familiar to the public, and Mr. Roosevelt, with the prestige of an ex-President of the United States, writing along entirely different but equally well-known lines, have each said things, whatever the motive, that a casual reader might believe were in conflict with the espionage act. But those whose responsibility it is to enforce this law do not believe a case could be made to stand against either of them in the courts.

The law must be administered as it is found. Any layman can read the facts as stated in the opinion of the court in the department's case against Watson's paper, "The Jeffersonian" (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of August 22, 1917), and see that it was very different from Mr. Roosevelt's case against Mr. Hearst.

If Mr. Roosevelt means to intimate that I was instrumental, directly or indirectly, in obtaining for Mr. Hearst, or any company or association with which he is connected, a restoration of news or cable facilities which had been withdrawn from him by the allied governments, he is in error. I will say further, I know of no one who performed such a service for him.

As to the telegram to Mr. Arthur Brisbane—I quote from Mr. Roosevelt:

"Mr. Burleson says of Mr. Hearst's alter ego that he 'congratulates the people of Chicago because they are to have the benefit of Mr. Brisbane's able and unselfish efforts for justice and freedom and true democratic government.'"

The telegram sent was as follows:

"From press reports I note that you are to be the editor of the New Herald and Examiner, and I congratulate the people of Chicago that they are to have the benefit of your able and unselfish efforts in furtherance of the progress of the city and the development of the new paper, and I indulge the hope that it will always stand for justice, freedom, and the principles of true democratic government."

However this telegram may have been handled or whatever its effects, the purpose in sending it was far from that charged by Mr. Roosevelt.

In conclusion, to those who have the will to launch assaults against public officials who are discharging their duty, I commend a careful reading of the eighth stanza in Tennyson's "The Grandmother."

Mr. LEWIS subsequently said: Mr. President, this morning there was put into the RECORD a statement of Col. Roosevelt upon a public matter. In reply to that there was something from the Postmaster General, which was put into the RECORD. Both referred, however, to a statement of Mr. Hearst. Might I ask at this time, sir, that the statement of Mr. Hearst be also put in the RECORD along with this same matter? I neglected to ask it this morning, being busy in a committee. I thank the Senator from Georgia [Mr. SMITH] for permitting me to interrupt the proceedings at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. POINDEXTER in the chair). The Senate hears the request of the Senator from Illinois for unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD the paper referred to by him. Is there objection?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. The Senator does not ask that it be read?

Mr. LEWIS. Not that it be read; I do not desire for it to take any time at all.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I do not object, in view of the fact that the other two papers have been placed in the RECORD, but I am going to express the hope that the incident is closed.

Mr. LEWIS. I think the Senator from New Hampshire accurately states the matter, that this does close it so far as the RECORD is concerned, and it is to be hoped so far as the public is concerned.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In the absence of objection, permission to insert in the RECORD the matter referred to by the Senator from Illinois is given.

The matter referred to is as follows:

MR. HEARST'S CRITICAL ANALYSIS OF MR. ROOSEVELT AND HIS POLITICAL PURPOSES.

MOUNT CLEMENS, MICH., May 13.

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK AMERICAN:

Mr. Roosevelt, though notably less able and less respectable, is emphatically the Asquith of American politics. He is out of power, and he is greedily eager to get back into power, and he does not scruple at any methods, no matter how unfair to the administration or how harmful to the country, in order to accomplish his purely selfish political purposes.

The attack which Mr. Roosevelt now makes upon the administration is just as baseless as the attack which Asquith made upon Lloyd-George, and it will prove to be just as futile in its effect upon the administration and just as fatal in its effect upon Mr. Roosevelt.

The immediate causes of Mr. Roosevelt's present outburst are two in number.

The first cause is the fact that the magazine which hires Mr. Roosevelt at \$1 per word to make vicious attacks upon the Government of the United States during war time was excluded from the mails in one issue for a wholly false and absolutely unjustified attack upon the President of the United States and the diplomacy of the United States, calculated to bring our Government and our people into contempt and consequently to injure our cause.

Mr. Roosevelt did not write this particular article, but it is conceivable that any menace to the existence of a magazine which pays so liberally for political slander arouses a natural concern on the part of Mr. Roosevelt for his own profitable, if not patriotic, contract.

The second cause of Mr. Roosevelt's immediate agitation is the fact that the small and lonely New York newspaper, which is supporting Mr. Roosevelt's perpetual aspirations for the Presidency, was recently rebuked as a public enemy by the representative of the United States Government for printing as news certain articles which had no foundation in fact, and which discredited the officers of the United States Army and held them up to ridicule and contumely without the slightest basis of truth or justice in the allegations.

GOVERNMENT LENIENT WITH ROOSEVELT.

In any other country in the world, in critical war times, traitorous publications like Mr. Roosevelt's magazine and Mr. Roosevelt's newspaper, whose only objects in printing falsehood were petty political spite against the President and partisan support of the aspirations of a rival candidate, would have been wholly suppressed as treasonable.

Our Government, however, is lenient with such offending publications and with Mr. Roosevelt himself, because the administration properly believes that in a republic the right of free speech and free publication should be preserved, even though there be occasional disloyal abuses of this right, as in the case of Mr. Roosevelt and the magazine which hires him and the newspaper which politically supports him.

That the United States Government was entirely right in its denunciation of Mr. Roosevelt's New York newspaper was conclusively proven in the suit which arose out of the resignation from that newspaper of its editor, Mr. Frank H. Simonds, well known throughout this country for his patriotic articles on the war.

INVENTED NEWS AND CONCOCTED CABLES.

Mr. Simonds definitely stated and showed that his desire to retire from this disloyal paper was due to the fact that this paper habitually invented news and concocted cables in its own office for the purpose of manufacturing false material with which to attack the Government of the United States and the Army of the United States for small and selfish political purposes.

Of course, Mr. Simonds would not willingly remain connected with any disloyal publication, no matter how profitable that connection might be, but there is apparently nothing in Mr. Roosevelt's make-up to prevent his connection with any publication, no matter how traitorous, as long as that connection will serve to line his purse and further his unscrupulous methods of promoting his personal political aspirations.

Mr. Roosevelt's attempted reflections upon the Hearst publications are unimportant.

HEARST PAPERS ALWAYS CONSTRUCTIVE.

It is sufficient to say in reply that whatever criticism the Hearst publications indulged in was constructive criticism, founded upon established fact, not upon manufactured falsehood, and intended for the information and assistance of the administration and not for its discomfiture and destruction.

For years the Hearst publications have advocated preparedness and have been denounced as jingoism by the shortsighted for doing so.

For years these publications have advocated the extension of West Point and Annapolis and the establishment of national universities throughout the country to provide trained officers for the Army and Navy in time of need.

For years these publications have advocated the construction of the greatest Navy in the world, and the creation of a nationally owned merchant marine to act as an auxiliary Navy in time of war.

Ever since the beginning of the European war the Hearst publications have advocated universal service, and I personally went to Washington and wrote in the Washington Post a signed article appealing to my former associates in Congress to vote for universal service and at least make our own country safe for democracy.

NEED FOR IMMENSE EFFORT FOR DEFENSE.

Ever since the beginning of this European war the Hearst publications have dilated upon the formidableness of the German military machine, and the necessity for immediate and immense effort on the part of our country if we were to defend ourselves against that machine and eventually to overwhelm it.

If the advice of the Hearst publications had been taken we would be applying to-day in a determining way the supreme force which the President now calls for, and we would be winning to-day the glorious victory which we will assuredly win in due time anyway, in spite of delays, in spite of obstacles, in spite of partisan obstruction, and in spite of treacherous attacks in the rear by selfish politicians animated by personal ambitions.

Let me say in conclusion that the attack upon the administration and the incidental attack upon the Hearst publications, which are only seeking to secure justice for the administration, emanate from the reactionary influences of Wall Street.

MR. ROOSEVELT'S SINISTER SUPPORTERS.

The New York Tribune, which supports Mr. Roosevelt in his unpatriotic activities, is owned by the Mills and Reid estates, two of the

greatest and most sinister of New York financial forces, and not even wholly American in character, as the Mills and Reid families are both intermarried with the English aristocracy.

The Metropolitan Magazine, which hires Mr. Roosevelt at a dollar a word, as professional vituperator of the President, is owned by the Whitney estate, which is administered by Harry Payne Whitney, grandson of Henry B. Payne, the Standard Oil magnate, and son of William C. Whitney, the New York traction magnate.

Nor is it unusual to find Mr. Roosevelt in such company or in the financial favor of such influences.

Mr. Roosevelt in 1912 ran for President as the candidate of the Steel Trust and to defeat Mr. Taft, who had prosecuted the Steel Trust.

Mr. Roosevelt was financed by Mr. Perkins, of the Steel Trust, and when Mr. Perkins, of the Steel Trust, refused to finance Mr. Roosevelt and his party in 1916, Mr. Roosevelt shamefully betrayed his Progressive Party into the hands of the reactionary Republicans.

ROOSEVELT INSTRUMENT OF STEEL TRUST.

Mr. Roosevelt has always been a badly camouflaged instrument of these sinister financial interests from the time that he personally, as President, allowed the United States Steel Corporation, in flagrant violation of the antitrust laws of the Nation, to absorb the Tennessee Coal & Iron Co., down to the time of the recent election in New York City, when he followed the lead of the Steel Trust and the Standard Oil Trust and declared against the nominee of his own party who had been regularly nominated by the Republican voters in the open primary, which Mr. Roosevelt had always advocated.

As Mr. Roosevelt and his unfounded allegations were overwhelmingly repudiated in the New York City election and as Mr. Asquith and his unfounded allegations were overwhelmingly repudiated in the House of Commons, so Mr. Roosevelt and every political and public traitor should be overwhelmingly repudiated whenever such an one sets himself disloyally against his constituted leaders and against the best interests of his country for the meanest of all motives, petty jealousy and personal gain.

WILLIAM RANDOLPH HEARST.

RENT PROFITEERING IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

MR. SAULSBURY. Mr. President, I was visited this morning by the president and, I think, one of the other officers of the Real Estate Brokers' Association here, and they gave me a copy of a resolution relating to the matter of rent profiteering and colorable sales, expressing a desire for an investigation in regard to the matter, and asked me to present the resolution to the Senate.

I think it is very proper to present the resolution to the Senate, but I expressly stated to them that I did not wish to imply that I would take any part or take any time for an investigation of the conditions to which the resolution relates.

The investigation already made by the District Committee has satisfied me, as it did the other members of the committee, and I thought pretty fairly satisfied the Senate, that the conditions regarding rent profiteering in the District were such that the thing for Congress now to do was to take action to prevent it. I stated that with that understanding I would present this resolution. I send it to the desk and ask that it may be read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It will be read.

The Secretary read as follows:

The following resolution was offered and carried unanimously at a meeting of the executive committee of the Real Estate Brokers' Association Thursday, May 23, 1918:

"Whereas charges have been indiscriminately circulated in both Houses of Congress and in the public press of the Capital City to the effect that the real estate owners and agents of Washington are profiteering and making 'colorable' sales of their property; and

"Whereas the Real Estate Brokers' Association of Washington, D. C., after an investigation, is satisfied that said real estate owners and agents are not guilty of the charges made; and

"Whereas said agents are unwilling to rest under these baseless and scandalous charges: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That we, the members of the Real Estate Brokers' Association, reposing an abiding faith in the fairness of the Congress and its constituent Members, respectfully ask for a congressional investigation of the charges made, holding itself and the real estate brokers forming the association ready to produce such testimony, data, records, and books as may be needful to thoroughly ventilate the questions at issue; be it further

"Resolved, That the investigations requested be instituted at the earliest possible moment."

CHAS. W. FAIRFAX, *President.*

HERBERT T. SHANNON, *Vice President.*

CHAS. S. SHREVE, *Secretary.*

ALGERNON S. GARDINER, *Treasurer.*

MR. SAULSBURY. Mr. President, I assured these gentlemen that, so far as lay in the power of the District of Columbia Committee, with which I have been connected, as near exact justice in all cases brought to their attention would be looked after as could be brought about by general laws; that the conditions which we had found to exist here were not unusual in the world at the present time; that laws have been passed governing many cases in Great Britain and in many of the British colonies, and those laws have from time to time been amended as conditions were found which required amendment to prevent or to produce nearer justice in all cases; and while no one could undertake to present a completed scheme covering the cases which had been uncovered in this city with respect to rent profiteering, yet they could be assured that it would only be a short time, if they could present cases of sufficient hardship which seemed to be of a general character, before Congress would remedy such legislation as it started in this matter by amending the law.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. May I ask the Senator—
Mr. SAULSBURY. If the Senator will pardon me just a moment, I will then yield to him.

In connection with this same matter I received this morning a letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy describing the conditions, stating that the conditions in this city were very injuriously affecting the personnel of that department. It seems to me that when a great department of the Government located in the city calls attention to a matter of this kind the letter from the Acting Secretary should also be presented, and I ask that the Secretary may read this letter from Acting Secretary Roosevelt.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read.
The Secretary read as follows:

NAVY DEPARTMENT,
Washington, May 23, 1918.

Hon. WILLARD SAULSBURY,
United States Senate.

MY DEAR SENATOR: The great unrest among civilian employees of the department caused by attempts at rent profiteering is seriously interfering with their efficiency, and I consider it very important that immediate relief should be given by the enactment of Senate joint resolution 152 or some similar measure.

Sincerely, yours,

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT,
Acting Secretary.

Mr. SAULSBURY. I will yield the floor if the Senator from Michigan desires it.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I do not wish to take the Senator from the floor.

Mr. SAULSBURY. I have no desire to continue.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I want to ask him if the whole theory of this legislation is not predicated upon the unjust exactions of the real estate brokers of Washington. If that is true, and they deny that their conduct is subject to criticism, it seems to me they ought to have an opportunity to be heard and that the request they make for an inquiry is a very proper and appropriate one.

Mr. SAULSBURY. If they had not been heard, and if this effort was being made without their knowledge, undoubtedly I would think they should be heard. But as a matter of fact, if not every real estate owner, certainly gentlemen representing all their associations, and many individual real estate owners have already been heard, and their testimony is in print as taken before the District of Columbia Committee, and can be readily referred to.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I do not wish to be put in the attitude of being a special defender of the real estate brokers. I have very little in common with them.

Mr. SAULSBURY. May I interrupt the Senator for a moment to ask that the only thing the real estate brokers seem to be charged with is being the nucleus for the formation of a combination in this matter. Of course, the offices of the real estate brokers, the renting agents, and the real estate dealers are the places where the owners who want to rent or sell would naturally congregate. In that way they have become the centers of the effort of the people who are endeavoring to raise rents in a general sort of way. I do not undertake to accuse anyone especially. I do not think there is a general combination of them.

The proposed law is not directed at the real estate brokers. It is directed at the real estate owners and whoever may represent them.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I do not want to let the opportunity go by without saying that I think the remedy proposed by the joint resolution now in conference will not meet the situation at all, that it will tend to restrict the building of new residences and apartments and that it will operate to so curtail the facilities so much needed by the large influx of new employees here as to make the situation much more embarrassing and difficult than it would be without that legislation.

Mr. SAULSBURY. I may express the hope, Mr. President, that the Senator will read the testimony which was taken by the District Committee in connection with all these matters.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President—

Mr. SAULSBURY. I desire particularly, if the Senator will pardon me a moment, to call attention to the fact that there is no building going on in Washington now except the finishing of contracts. The reason for that is obvious. The conditions do not permit the obtaining of material to carry out any extensive contracts. So far as hindering the construction of new buildings under private auspices I think that is entirely negligible absolutely. I yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. NORRIS. I wish to ask the Senator about the testimony to which he refers. In his statement he refers to the testimony of real estate owners, as I understood him.

Mr. SAULSBURY. There are a number of them who gave testimony.

Mr. NORRIS. The resolution the Senator presented comes from real estate brokers. Did the brokers testify before the committee?

Mr. SAULSBURY. I think very largely. Most of the important real estate agents of the city of Washington were before the committee.

Mr. NORRIS. The owners were also there and their testimony appears of record?

Mr. SAULSBURY. There were many owners there. Of course, as there are thousands and thousands of owners in Washington, the testimony of all of them was not taken.

Mr. NORRIS. The testimony was taken before the committee reported the joint resolution, which is now in conference?

Mr. SAULSBURY. Yes; and the testimony is printed.

Mr. NORRIS. I presume then it was the conclusion of the committee, since they reported the joint resolution after hearing the testimony, that rent profiteering was taking place.

Mr. SAULSBURY. It was the conclusion of every member of the committee. The action was unanimous in reporting the bill which came over from the House, or rather the Pomerene amendment to the Johnson bill, and also instructing the presentation of the joint resolution to cover the immediate present.

Mr. NORRIS. So, after hearing the testimony the committee unanimously agreed to the bill and also the joint resolution as necessary to save the situation?

Mr. SAULSBURY. The Senator precisely states the condition.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President, in relation to this matter I have received several letters from citizens in this District. They are all three of them short, and I should like to have the Secretary read them now in order that the Senate may have the advantage of the views presented. One is an owner, another is a real estate agent, and a third is a real estate brokers' association. They look at this matter from different standpoints and give different arguments. I think they are all interesting.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read.

The Secretary read as follows:

WASHINGTON, May 24, 1918.

Senator F. B. BRANDEGEE,
1521 K Street, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: My brother has just put up to me, on the rent-profiteering proposition, the fact that 11 out of his 18 tenants who have leases on his apartments sublet their apartments. Some never even moved in, and nearly all live elsewhere in town. It is quite evident from the copies of the subtenants' leases, which he secured from the real estate agents, that there was and is profiteering in rentals in this building.

Is it Senator SAULSBURY's idea that these people who do not occupy their leased apartments shall go on leasing from him and subletting at present profiteering figures? What he wants to do is to rent directly to the man who is going to live there and not to some one who sees a sure profit in his lease.

During this agitation he has been subjected to undeserved criticism by people not conversant with the facts, while the actual causes of the criticism have gone scot free and pocketed their profits.

As a matter of fact, he began his building in the spring of 1916, before we thought of war being brought home to us, on a regularly planned income scheme of rentals. He adhered to this strictly, although when the tenants moved in on November 1, 1917, the demand was on and the opportunity for greater rentals made easy.

If the Saulsbury resolution would suspend subletting during the war, it would open up nearly 50 per cent of this building to bona fide tenants and cut out profiteering, instead of further legalizing present profiteering by providing that "existing leases shall be continued to their present terms." These subletting conditions must prevail generally if one apartment house shows such a large percentage.

It would be better to provide that the lease of any Government employee shall automatically terminate on two weeks' notice if his work takes him and his family away from Washington and he expresses the wish to cancel the lease on the grounds that neither he nor his family have any further use for it.

The landlord can easily fill his place nowadays. The resolution already arranges that any new tenant shall pay the same as the old tenant. This would work very satisfactorily for the Government employee, because his responsibility for rent would terminate with his vacation of the premises for work elsewhere than in Washington. The subletting clause, which he permitted, protects the Government employee when his services are required elsewhere, but if the resolution provides that things shall stay as they are the profiteering will still go on, and henceforth the congressional approval.

Is there a chance for anything to be done about this so late in the day?

Yours, sincerely,

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I have not put that gentleman's name in because it is a personal letter to me, but I vouch for his large interests in Washington and his character and integrity.

Mr. SAULSBURY. I should like if agreeable to the Senator from Connecticut to comment on the letter just read at this time.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Certainly, provided the Senator will let the other two letters be read afterwards.

Mr. SAULSBURY. Of course, I have no desire to stop any one, but it seemed to me when that letter is read in regard to subletting it might be well to say that of course no law is necessary to prevent subletting unless the landlord consents,

if the lease is properly drawn. Personally, I never knew a lease of real estate or any portion of it properly drawn which did not require the consent of the landlord to any subletting. So the remedy is entirely in the hands of the landlord.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. But, if the Senator will permit me to interrupt him there, this is a case where the subleases have already been made and the subtenants are in possession, and under the Senator's resolution they have been guaranteed to stay in possession at exorbitant rents to the original lessee and can not be evicted.

Mr. SAULSBURY. Until—

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Until after the war.

Mr. SAULSBURY. Or until proper legislation is enacted by Congress. The Senator, of course, will understand that it is impossible in the form of a joint resolution to provide for a great many cases of hardship. I may say that I think one of the great troubles in this city is due to the greed of the original lessee in subletting to other people.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I agree with the Senator.

Mr. SAULSBURY. That can be attended to. There should be no complaint on the part of the landlord if he assents to it and he thereby mixes himself in with the second contract subletting.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Of course, if the landlord allows a tenant to sublet, he does not necessarily know what his tenant is going to get, and he is not to be considered necessarily as the guilty party in the profiteering.

Mr. SAULSBURY. No; but that is in many cases what they are complaining of—

Mr. BRANDEGEE. That may be so.

Mr. SAULSBURY. That somebody else is getting money for their property which does not come into their pockets.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. But what I desire to suggest to the Senator is this: The Senator says that all these cases that his joint resolution does not provide for, all these cases of injustice that we clearly see will probably be worked by its adoption, are to be corrected by future legislation. They may be, and they may not be; but it seems to me that while the subject is before Congress the time is now to provide for all such cases as are brought to our attention which we think need to be provided for; not to dismiss the subject, and then get into a log jam of business here so that we can never take it up again. It seems to me this joint resolution is the one upon which we should perfect this whole matter.

Mr. SAULSBURY. I can assure the Senator that it is quite the desire of the committee that that should be done; but it is manifest that this sort of legislation can not now be perfected, and probably will not be perfected for some time, until the legislation which we shall get through in the form of the so-called Pomerene bill shall have been tried for some months, and whatever difficulties shall have then shown themselves will be corrected.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. President—

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I now ask that the other two communications be read, if the Senator from Texas desires to address himself to the subject matter.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I simply want to ask the Senator from Delaware a question in this connection. Is it not true that all contracts of lease contain a clause that a sublease can not be made without the consent of the lessor?

Mr. SAULSBURY. I have never seen a properly drawn lease that did not require the consent of the landlord to subletting; and I think they all do.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read as requested.

The Secretary read as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., May 23, 1918.

Senator BRANDEGEE,

United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: I wish you would read the inclosed copy of a letter addressed to Senator SAULSBURY. This is not theory, but a practical example of what would be the effects of his resolution.

Yours, very truly,

J. P. STORY, Jr.

MAY 22, 1918.

HON. WILLARD SAULSBURY,

United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: You will possibly recall my telephone conversation with you in respect to your resolution suspending the due processes of law for the recovery of possession of real estate. I asked that so-called "business property" be exempted. Your reply was that the resolution was interim legislation, pending action on the profiteering bill.

As passed by the House, your resolution may now suspend these processes for 30 days, for 30 months, or for 30 years—no one knows. The Government can have no interest, or the public for that matter, in the relations between landlord and tenant as respects "business property." I am speaking especially of stores, and a little thought must surely convince anyone of this fact.

The merchants of Washington to-day are reaping profits undreamed of before. The number of their customers has greatly increased, and the volume in dollars very much more proportionately. The merchants have curtailed expenses in delivery, curtailed credits, and generally are making net profits greatly in excess of former years.

Your resolution prevents the holder of business property to measure the value of his property by the measure of value that it is to its occupant, and it merely increases the profits of the user.

However, the greatest evil, and, in justice, it amounts to an evil, is the sweeping manner in which the resolution has ignored actual conditions in the real estate business. Much business real estate in all cities, and particularly in Washington, in recent years has been rented temporarily at nominal rentals to tide over vacancies between permanent tenants. Also, some very valuable business properties, not entirely improved, are rented at low rentals on short-term leases pending the opportunity to rebuild with modern improvements.

The House resolution will continue indefinitely the income loss by the owner of these properties; furthermore, will prevent the improvement of the properties, and, therefore, of the city; the only result will play into the hands of present tenants already paying a wholly inadequate return.

I have in mind several leases of property under these conditions. One is rented at \$100 per month, by the month, and appraised by the assessors at over \$110,000. The owner is actually at a loss for expenses and taxes on this property. He has an offer to lease it at something over \$7,000 per year. The resolution, if passed, would prevent his getting possession. This is only an example; I can cite you many similar cases.

Should your resolution go through in any form, in simple justice I urge that it be amended so that upon the expiration of existing leases, if tenants avail themselves of the immunities of your resolution, that they will not be entitled to such immunity, unless they will agree to pay a rent that will equal 7 per cent net, allowed by the Pomerene bill.

Very truly, yours,

JOHN P. STORY, Jr.

Mr. SAULSBURY. Mr. President, I merely wish to call the attention of the Senator from Connecticut to this matter. That is about the sort of complaint or kind of letter that one gets from everybody who has any special case which he thinks ought to be remedied; and there are, of course, many of them. The only thing that we can attempt to do is to deal with the generality of cases, and when it comes to providing for fair rents the Pomerene bill will do that; there is no doubt about it. As soon as we can get that bill through—and it is now in conference, or it has been returned to the other House for the appointment of conferees—this whole subject can be attended to comprehensively. My suggestion about the matter is that this is attempting to put the cart before the horse.

I desire only to add that I hope that Senators will understand that the standpoint I take in this matter is that there is no particular sanctity about real estate over any other property. Every State in the Union, I presume, has laws against usury. Those laws allow a man to obtain so much in the way of gain or increase from the use which he allows another man to have of the money which he is able to loan him on such security or in any form that he desires. For the most part I suppose it will approximate 6 per cent throughout the country. The different State laws provide different penalties. My theory about this rent resolution, and the one that appealed to me most strongly, is that such conditions have come to this District that we are called upon to prohibit rack-renting—what is known here as rent profiteering—in the same way that in the history of the legislation of English-speaking peoples it has been found necessary to prohibit the man who has money to lend from squeezing the poor fellow who needs the money.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I agree entirely with the Senator that rack-renting or excessive profiteering in real estate, certainly at this time, is worse than usury; but in order to correct usury or rack-renting it is not necessary to leap into confiscation.

The instance just cited in the letter which has been read is a case of confiscation. The writer cites a case, and says he knows of several others, where a man owning a building worth \$100,000, which he has rented for \$100 a month, simply to get what he could out of it to help pay the taxes and insurance—a piece of business property, not a residence property at all, in connection with which anybody could be deprived of shelter or lodging—is now offered \$7,000 a year for it in the open market. It is worth that; but under this bill the tenant who is getting it for \$1,200 a year is to keep it during the war, although in the market it is worth \$7,000 a year, and the owner, who has been out the interest and taxes on it for years, now that it has become legitimately worth \$7,000 a year, is to be prohibited from recouping his losses. I do not consider that to be fair; it does not seem to me to be an extravagant suggestion to say that, even in this joint resolution, at this time, without waiting to see whether the so-called Pomerene bill can secure the assent of both branches of Congress at this busy session, we could exempt business property.

Mr. SAULSBURY. May I address a question to the Senator?

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Certainly.

Mr. SAULSBURY. I assume, of course, that the Senator does not think that because temporarily a man may be deprived of getting the full rental value of his property—and there is no desire on the part of anybody to prevent him from getting

a reasonable rental for his property—until we can correct that—and we can not do it now by this joint resolution, because the joint resolution has been agreed upon in conference—that hundreds and possibly thousands of people should be turned out of their homes by rack renters and rent profiteers.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I do not object at all to a resolution going through which would continue the status quo during this session of Congress, provided other legislation on the subject is passed.

Mr. SAULSBURY. I can assure the Senator that it is the desire of the committee that such legislation shall be passed; but, of course, he knows quite as well as anyone else that we can not control the form in which finished legislation is finally enacted by Congress.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I know the Senator can not, and he can not control the action of Congress, and yet he is asking us to adopt what he admits to be a defective piece of legislation, which does not comprehend numerous classes of exceptional cases, in the expectation merely that later something better will be passed at this session; but if it is not passed, then the joint resolution stands. I wish to say, Mr. President, that the Senator—

Mr. SAULSBURY. Mr. President—

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I will yield to the Senator in just a moment. The Senator must realize that his joint resolution is not for a stated period. While we hope this war will be over in a year, it may go on for 10 or 20 years. There was a thirty years' war once in Europe.

Mr. GALLINGER. And a hundred years' war.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Yes; a hundred years' war in Holland. What I want to suggest to the Senator is this: We passed through the Judiciary Committee, and subsequently passed through Congress, if I remember correctly, legislation preventing the collection of debts, the issuance of judicial decrees of foreclosure, and so forth, against soldiers who are in the Army in the service abroad. It was said that it was unconstitutional; that contention was vigorously made by several members of the committee; and it was only justified in our judgment upon the theory, based upon a decision of the Pennsylvania Supreme Court, that the remedy could be postponed for a reasonable time; but to say that during the period of the war, which is perfectly indefinite and may be 50 years is a reasonable time to deprive a man of his property it seems to me is to go against every notion of a man's right in this country.

Now I yield to the Senator.

Mr. SAULSBURY. Mr. President, I only wanted to say when the Senator said the legislation was admittedly defective, that that admission goes to this extent only—and the same admission must apply to any piece of legislation that is proposed—that undoubtedly cases will arise, no matter what the legislation is and no matter what is proposed, where individual hardship will be worked; but it is for the benefit of the generality of people that legislation of this kind is primarily enacted. The Senator is so good a lawyer that I am sure he knows that in the history of the legislation of the English-speaking race equity courts have had to be instituted from time to time for the correction of those defects in the law which worked injustices to the individual, the remedy for which theretofore had been in the king's conscience. We will have to continue to legislate to correct defects. Every country in the world that has instituted legislation of this kind has found defects to be subsequently corrected.

I do not profess to be superior to all the minds that are opposed to the proposed legislation; but I have studied the legislation of England and the British colonies. This measure is intended to provide, and was intended to provide when introduced, for a temporary condition. I do not propose to admit that this legislation is defective further than that it may work a few cases of individual hardship as against many cases of hardship which will be remedied. I think it is the best we have been able to originate.

I will say to the Senator, if he will pardon me further, that this joint resolution was debated in the Senate quite generally, and the Senate had an opportunity to amend it. We have now gotten as far as the conference committee, and the conference committee report will be submitted. There is, of course, an end of amending proposed legislation, and that is the condition in this instance. I know that if the Senator will prepare a joint resolution or prepare the form of a bill which will provide against any injustice that he can see in such legislation as this, the committee will gladly report in favor of it, and gladly assist him in getting it through.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President, the Senator talks about courts of equity being instituted to relieve the rigors of the com-

mon law. Of course that is well known; but the Senator is proposing a measure which, if adopted, is accompanied by no court of equity to relieve its injustices and its rigors.

The Senator talks about particular cases, and says it is impossible to provide for every particular case. It appears from the letter of Mr. Story, written to the Senator on the 19th of May, five or six days ago, while this measure was before the conference committee, that the writer of the letter did not ask the Senator to look after a particular case, but asked him to look after an entire class of property in the city of Washington, to wit, business property as distinguished from residence property.

The Senator says it is beyond the power of the Senate to amend the joint resolution that is before the Senate, and asks that another resolution be prepared to provide for a great class of cases which surely should not be ignored. The entire business property of this great city of Washington is subject to the provisions of the joint resolution. That class of property ought not to be included; and the report ought to be recommitted, in my opinion, inasmuch as simply one sentence would cure the whole defect. Yet we are asked to rush this measure through now, and take the chance that somebody else will prepare some other legislation to cure what is a manifest and grave defect in the conference report.

Mr. SAULSBURY. The Senator, of course, is aware that we are not considering the conference report now.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. We are not considering it, and the discussion is all out of order, except by unanimous consent, I understand that.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Connecticut if the instance referred to by Mr. Story concerns property needed by the Government for governmental purposes?

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I know nothing about it; I never said a word to him; I simply received that letter.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Evidently it does not, but I did not know but that the Senator knew.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. No; I do not.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. If it does not concern property that the Government wants, and that could be taken in an orderly way, to deprive the owner of it, or to attempt to do so, would not stand at all, and ought not to stand.

I want to make this observation, and then I am through. I do not believe we are going to get any legislation except this joint resolution, and the moment that the joint resolution is passed it will tie the thing up so close that the advocates of the measure will be perfectly satisfied, and I do not believe we are going to get any further legislation at all. Perhaps I am wrong about that, but there is an attitude of absolute hostility to it in the committee, as every Senator knows.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Of course, if this joint resolution is passed and any other corrective legislation designed to eliminate some of the provisions in this joint resolution is attempted, it will undoubtedly be met with the most vigorous resistance from the people who will be profiting unduly by the operations of this joint resolution.

Now, I ask that the other letter be read. I have been interrupted a great deal; I did not intend to take so much time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Secretary will read.

The Secretary read as follows:

REAL ESTATE BROKERS ASSOCIATION
OF WASHINGTON CITY, D. C.,

Office of the President, 1342 New York Avenue, May 23, 1918.

Hon. FRANK B. BRANDEGEE,
Senate Office Building, City.

DEAR SENATOR BRANDEGEE: The Saulsbury antieviction resolution, as amended by the House is unfair and inequitable to tenants as well as owners. It should never be enacted into law as permanent legislation for several reasons.

1. It fails to reach the evil complained of.
2. It does not undo any existing profiteering but continues it, nor does it prohibit future profiteering.
3. It penalizes the patriotic owners, who have not raised rentals, although they may be paying 100 per cent more for maintenance charges.
4. It encourages subletting at high prices, as original tenants will voluntarily pay increased rentals to owners for the privilege of subletting.
5. It places no restriction on rentals for vacant quarters, which will destroy uniformity of sums paid by tenants.
6. It closes temporary available rental space, such as rooms, apartments, and houses, that will not be offered the public, because possession can not be regained by owners during the war and a year thereafter.
7. It does not abate notices of eviction for selling, as 95 per cent of all sales are to home buyers.
8. It prevents the development for housing and office purposes of large sites now used as gasoline stations, unsanitary dwellings, and shops.
9. It justifies owners selling, rather than renting on an unprofitable basis.

10. It jeopardizes the majority of owners who have mortgaged properties because a restricted market will hold down prices at private and public sale.

11. It injures the value of estates (beneficiaries being minors, lunatics, etc.) when sales must be made to pay legacies and to make distributions among heirs.

Very truly, yours,

CHAS. W. FAIRFAX, *President.*

Mr. SAULSBURY. May I say just a word in regard to that, Mr. President? It reminds me very much of the man who was charged with keeping a rabid dog, which bit somebody. He gave possibly 11 reasons, as the real estate men have done; or it may have been 111. He said no man had been bitten, that the dog was not there, and went on with the other 109 reasons, and wound up finally by saying that he had never owned a dog. [Laughter.] Now, I have no doubt that these real estate men could have added a hundred other reasons and had 111 or made them less, if they had wanted to.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me to ask him a question? I will take but a moment.

Mr. SAULSBURY. Certainly.

Mr. GALLINGER. Perhaps I have not been as diligent as I ought to have been in analyzing the joint resolution. Does the joint resolution put business property upon the same basis as residence property? That is to say, does it provide that the owners of business property shall not charge more than they charged on a date mentioned in the joint resolution?

Mr. SAULSBURY. There is no date mentioned in the joint resolution, but there is no distinction at all as between the different kinds of property, and tenants are continued at the same rent. It is practically a tenants' moratorium. That is the effect of it.

Mr. GALLINGER. I was requested by a friend three or four days ago to find two small rooms, if I could, in some business building in Washington, he desiring to occupy them. I have attempted it in five different buildings, and there is not a room to be secured. Under those circumstances, where the demand exceeds the supply, does the Senator think it right to say that those people shall not increase the rent at all?

Mr. SAULSBURY. I think they should be limited in the amount of rent which they receive from their property, and that all of them should be. The men who have increased the rents have brought about this condition; and I think the time has come in this city when the renting of real estate must be regulated in the same way that the loaning of money is regulated here and everywhere else in the country.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, this joint resolution continues a rent that may have been fair a year ago and may be unfair to-day; and to undertake to say to the owners of a building where the demand for rooms is greater than the supply that no increase whatever shall be allowed is to my mind an absolute and cruel injustice.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. It is confiscation.

Mr. ASHURST. I call for the regular order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The regular order is the presentation of petitions and memorials. The Senate will receive a message from the House of Representatives.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by J. C. South, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House insists upon its amendment to the bill (S. 4482) to amend an act entitled "An act to authorize the establishment of a Bureau of War-Risk Insurance in the Treasury Department," approved September 2, 1914, as amended, disagreed to by the Senate, agrees to the conference asked for by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. SIMS, Mr. RAYBURN, and Mr. ESCH, managers at the conference on the part of the House.

The message also announced that the House agrees to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 8764) to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces in commemoration of the one hundredth anniversary of the admission of the State of Illinois into the Union.

The message further announced that the House agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 152) to prevent rent profiteering in the District of Columbia.

The message also announced that the House disagrees to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 10534) making appropriations for the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919, and for other purposes, agrees to the conference asked for by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. PADGETT, Mr. TALBOTT, Mr. RIORDAN, Mr. BUTLER, and Mr. BROWNING managers at the conference on the part of the House.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. OVERMAN. At a meeting of the Equal Suffrage League, of Greensboro, N. C., the following resolution was passed in favor of the Federal suffrage amendment and protesting at the delay in the passage of the resolution in the Senate and urging its immediate passage. I ask that the resolution be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GREENSBORO, N. C. May 23, 1918.

Senator OVERMAN,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: A meeting of the Greensboro, N. C., Equal Suffrage League was held on the evening of May 22, at which the following resolution was passed.

We ask that you give the matter your earnest consideration.

Will you kindly read our resolution into the RECORD.

Sincerely, yours,

Mrs. MARY B. CRAWFORD, *Secretary.*

Resolution.

Since the principle of democracy, for which we are engaged in war against autocratic Germany, includes the equal enfranchisement of women and men, and the President of the United States, supported by the national executive committees of the Democratic and Republican Parties, believing in this truth, has declared in favor of the Federal suffrage amendment, and our allies, Great Britain and Canada, have enfranchised their women as a war measure, thus giving us second place in the realization of democratic principles: Be it therefore

Resolved, That the suffragists of Greensboro, N. C., protest at the delay in the passage of the Federal suffrage amendment in the Senate of the United States and urge the immediate passage of the suffrage resolution now pending.

Mrs. AL FAIRBROTHER,
Mrs. B. N. MANN,
HARRIET W. ELLIOTT,
Resolution Committee.

Mr. VARDAMAN. I ask unanimous consent to present and have printed in the RECORD a short resolution from the Winona (Miss.) Equal Suffrage League in favor of the constitutional amendment giving women the right to vote. I also present a resolution adopted by the W. R. Barksdale Camp, United Confederate Veterans, of Grenada, Miss., indorsing the resolution. I wish to say, Mr. President, that I would not ask that these resolutions be printed in the RECORD if I were not requested so to do by my constituents.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WINONA, MISS., May 22, 1918.

To the Hon. JAMES K. VARDAMAN,
Senate of the United States:

Whereas the other nations of the world are rapidly enfranchising their women; and

Whereas our Government is calling upon its women to give their all toward a war for democracy, and the call has already found a hearty response; and

Whereas the liquor interests of the United States have come upon the scene, and are now engaged in waging a bitter fight against the suffrage amendment:

Resolved, That we, the members of the Winona Equal Suffrage League, do most earnestly urge you to vote for and use your influence in the passing of the resolution for the enfranchising of the women of the United States, and that these resolutions be read into the Senate record.

LOUISE DUNSTAN, *Secretary.*

GRENADA, MISS., May 18, 1918.

At the regular meeting of W. R. Barksdale Camp, No. 189, United Confederate Veterans, the following resolution was adopted by rising vote, and a copy ordered sent to the President, Senators, and Representatives:

Resolved, That we, the Grenada County Confederate Veterans, in annual meeting assembled, do hereby reaffirm and reiterate that we tender our services to President Wilson in his noble defense of our Government, in the defense of right and justice of humanity, in democratic promises of freedom and liberty against monarchy and the atrociousness of German despotic Kaiserism.

J. W. YOUNG, *Commander.*
J. W. SHARP, *Adjutant.*

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I have a copy of resolutions adopted by the Cotton Exchange and Board of Trade of Augusta, Ga., on the subject of short-line railroads, which they have sent to their Senators and desire to have presented to Congress. I ask that the resolutions be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the Railroad Commission of the State of Georgia, with commendable initiative and purpose, has called a meeting of all the railroad commissions of the Southeastern States to convene in the city of Atlanta on the 24th day of May, 1918, to confer concerning the threatened disaster that will result to innumerable communities and short-line railroads if the latter, under existing conditions, are excluded from Government operation and control; and

Whereas the Augusta Cotton Exchange and Board of Trade believes that it would be unfair, undemocratic, and destructive of immense property investments, numberless homes, farms, schools, churches, and all that goes to make up the life of many thriving and patriotic communities should the short-line railroads serving said communities be forced by unequal competition with the trunk-line systems under Government operation to go into bankruptcy and ultimately to suspend operation; and

Whereas the Augusta Cotton Exchange and Board of Trade believes that full consideration and publicity should be given to the calamitous results that will inevitably follow the proposed elimination of short-line railroads from Government control, while the trunk-line systems are retained and favored by the financial and routing policies adopted by the Government; and

Whereas the Augusta Cotton Exchange and Board of Trade believes in fair play for the smaller interests of the country as well as the larger ones, and believes in a wise and far-seeing conservation of all our national resources; and

Whereas the Augusta Cotton Exchange and Board of Trade is confident that fair and considerate treatment of the short-line railroads and of the communities dependent upon them will be accorded by the Director General of Railroads when the full facts have been presented to his attention: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Augusta Cotton Exchange and Board of Trade commends the action of the Railroad Commission of Georgia in calling a meeting for consideration of this most important matter; that the members of the Augusta Cotton Exchange and Board of Trade, as loyal and patriotic business men interested in the welfare of the country, express it as their conviction that the short-line railroads of the country should be continued under Government operation and control upon a fair basis of compensation so long as the trunk-line systems are likewise operated and controlled by the Government; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the chairman of the Railroad Commission of Georgia, to the Director General of Railroads at Washington, to Representatives of the State of Georgia in the United States Senate, and to the Representative of the tenth congressional district of Georgia in the House of Representatives.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I wish to have read the telegram which I send to the desk from the Dallas Equal Suffrage Association.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The telegram will be read.

The Secretary read the telegram, as follows:

DALLAS, TEX., May 24, 1918.

Hon. MORRIS SHEPPARD,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

Will you please have read into the RECORD the resolution passed this morning urging an immediate vote on the Federal suffrage amendment. We thank you again for your support and influence.

DALLAS EQUAL SUFFRAGE ASSOCIATION.

Mr. NELSON presented petitions of sundry citizens of the State of Minnesota, praying for the submission of a Federal suffrage amendment to the legislatures of the several States, which were ordered to lie on the table.

INCREASE OF MILITARY ESTABLISHMENT.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill (S. 4459) to amend an act entitled "An act to authorize the President to increase temporarily the Military Establishment of the United States," approved May 18, 1917, reported it with an amendment and submitted a report (No. 466) thereon.

ELLA OLIVER RICHARDSON ET AL.

Mr. RANSDELL. From the Committee on Public Lands I report back favorably with amendments the bill (S. 4068) for the relief of Ella Oliver Richardson and Edmund Richardson, of New Orleans, La. It is a private bill, and it will take about two minutes to pass it. I ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, does the Senator ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered at this time?

Mr. RANSDELL. I do. It will take but a minute. It is a private bill and is unanimously reported.

Mr. ASHURST. I will not object, then, Mr. President, if it takes no longer than a minute.

Mr. RANSDELL. I do not think it will. The bill is very short.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Louisiana asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill reported by him. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Public Lands with amendments.

The first amendment was, on page 2, line 1, after the word "six," to insert "and ninety one-hundredths"; in line 3, after the word "Louisiana," to insert "approximately five hundred and eighteen and ninety-three hundredths acres"; in the same line, after the word "acre," to strike out "Lands" and insert "lands"; and, in line 6, after the word "years," to insert: "Provided, That proper application for the purchase of these lands be filed hereunder in the district land office within six months from the passage of this act, and that no adverse claim thereto be officially on record as pending when the application is allowed and the sale is made," so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to sell and patent to Ella Oliver Richardson and Edmund Richardson the west fractional half of southwest fractional quarter of section 2, 27.24 acres; all fractional section 11, 320 acres; all that part of northeast quarter of northwest quarter section 13 lying west of the eastern boundary of what was formerly section 40, approximately 24.84 acres; northwest quarter of northwest quarter section 27, 39.95 acres; south half of northeast quarter and northwest quarter of northeast quarter section 28, 106.90 acres; all situated in township 18 north, range 10 east, Louisiana meridian, in East Carroll and Madison Parishes, La., approximately 518.93 acres, at \$1.25 per acre, lands which they

and their grantors have occupied under claim and color of title and open and notorious possession for upward of 50 years: *Provided*, That proper application for the purchase of these lands be filed hereunder in the district land office within six months from the passage of this act, and that no adverse claim thereto be officially on record as pending when the application is allowed and the sale is made.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BLACKFEET RESERVATION, MONT.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I ask leave to withdraw the report submitted by me from the Committee on Indian Affairs on the bill (S. 4404) repealing that portion of the Indian appropriation act of March 1, 1907 (34 Stat. L., pp. 1015, 1035), which relates to the disposal of the surplus unallotted lands within the Blackfeet Reservation, in Montana, for the purpose of making a correction.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the report is withdrawn.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. FLETCHER:

A bill (S. 4605) to protect the insignia of the Young Men's Christian Association, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHAMBERLAIN:

A bill (S. 4606) to authorize the Secretary of War to exchange certain lands owned by the United States in Monroe County, Pa., for certain other adjacent lands owned by the Monroe Water Supply Co.;

A bill (S. 4607) to amend section 7 of "An act to authorize the President to increase temporarily the Military Establishment of the United States," approved May 18, 1917; and

A bill (S. 4608) to protect the military and naval forces of the United States against venereal diseases, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ASHURST:

A bill (S. 4609) to amend the war-risk insurance act as amended; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. STERLING:

A bill (S. 4610) granting an increase of pension to George C. Stearns; to the Committee on Pensions.

MANUFACTURE OF MALT AND VINOUS LIQUORS.

Mr. JONES of Washington. On yesterday the bill (H. R. 11945) to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to carry out, during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919, the purposes of the act entitled "An act to provide further for the national security and defense by stimulating agriculture and facilitating the distribution of agricultural products," was received from the House of Representatives and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. The bill contains a limitation on one of the paragraphs of appropriation relating to the use of foodstuffs in the manufacture of beer. It is simply a limitation upon the appropriation. It provides that that appropriation shall not be expended unless the President issues a proclamation under legislation heretofore passed.

I think that is very unwise legislation. In a way I am glad that it was put in the bill, so as to open the field for action by the Senate upon that measure. I wish to offer a proposed amendment to the bill, striking out that condition and inserting a legislative prohibition against the further use of foodstuffs in the manufacture of malt or vinous liquors. I ask that the amendment may be read, printed, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. In connection with it I want to read a paragraph from a letter which I have received.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be read for the information of the Senate.

The Secretary read as follows:

On page 5, line 5, after "\$6,100,000," strike out the remainder of the paragraph and insert the following: "From and after 30 days from the date of the approval of this act no foods, fruits, food materials, or feeds shall, during the continuance of the present war, be used in the production of malt or vinous liquors for beverage purposes, and anyone who willfully violates this provision or any rule or regulation made to carry the same into effect shall be punished by a fine not exceeding \$5,000 or by imprisonment for not more than two years, or both."

Mr. JONES of Washington. When this matter was up in the Senate before it was claimed that organized labor was against a provision of that sort. I have here a letter by the editor of the Unionist, a newspaper of Chicago, having a heading, "News of the American Federation of Labor: Social and Industrial Betterment," and so forth, which I ask may be printed in the

RECORD. I want to read just a paragraph from the letter to the Senate. It says:

I believe that I speak for an overwhelming majority of labor leaders when I say that in this crisis, when the demand for men to fight and to work is so urgent, that we are opposed to any institution or practice that diverts or cripples labor in the production of nonessentials or that wastes food, fuel, transportation facilities, chemicals, or any other things so necessary for the winning of this war.

Then he calls attention to the use of foodstuffs in the manufacture of beer, and asks that it be prohibited. I ask that this letter, together with the subheadings, be inserted in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE UNIONIST,
Chicago, May 21, 1918.

Senator WESLEY L. JONES,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR JONES: When the Nation is at war, patriotic men and women will bend every energy and subordinate every other interest to the winning of the war. This is particularly true in a war such as we now wage for liberty, democracy, and brotherhood.

I believe that I speak for an overwhelming majority of labor leaders when I say that in this crisis, when the demand for men to fight and to work is so urgent, that we are opposed to any institution or practice that diverts or cripples labor in the production of nonessentials, or that wastes food, fuel, transportation facilities, chemicals, or any other things so necessary for the winning of this war.

I need not call your attention to the fact that as a waster the liquor traffic is the chief offender. The more quickly that war-time prohibition can be enacted the more quickly will victory come and peace with its constructive program will be entered upon. I believe you may depend upon labor to back this program loyally.

Most sincerely, yours,

WM. CASTLEMAN, Editor.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, does the Senator ask that the letter be referred to the committee also?

Mr. JONES of Washington. Oh, yes. I assume that the letter will be referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It will be so referred.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President, I received a similar letter from the same gentleman, as I remember, and I note that he believes that he represents the overwhelming mass of the labor leaders of the country. He did not inclose any credentials to that effect in the letter to me, except his own belief about it. I rarely get a petition or suggestion of any kind about any subject from anybody but that he is quite sure that he represents the overwhelming mass of the American people, in his opinion, and if he does not he ought to, or the great mass ought to think as he does; so I take that for what it is worth.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, I assume that the Senator from Connecticut will take this for what he thinks it is worth. I know that those who have opposed this legislation heretofore have purported to speak for labor, but they did not present very many credentials, either; and when what credentials were presented were analyzed, it was found that they did not represent very many of the people of the country. I present that letter for just what it is worth, and the committee will no doubt give it due weight.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President, I was one of those who opposed this legislation before, and I oppose it now. I have never pretended to represent labor, or to represent anybody or anything except my own opinion upon this question.

AIRCRAFT PRODUCTION.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, in the morning press of yesterday it was announced that War Department officials yesterday stated that a thousand Liberty aircraft motors were shipped from two American factories last Friday, and that within a few weeks this figure will represent the daily average of American plants. I have the best of authority for stating that this announcement is entirely incorrect and therefore grossly misleading.

INTERNATIONAL INSTITUTE OF AGRICULTURE.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. President, I have a letter from David Lubin concerning the activities of the International Institute of Agriculture. I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in the RECORD without reading.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INSTITUT INTERNATIONAL D'AGRICULTURE,
Rome, 1c April 24, 1918.

Hon. HIRAM W. JOHNSON,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: I have received a copy of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 9, showing a debate in the Senate relative to the International Institute of Agriculture.

I have just gone over it, and I see that a twofold attack was made, first, personal, against myself; second, against the institute.

First of all, I thank you very much for your friendly intervention in my behalf; you have placed me under many obligations. As for the stand in behalf of the institute taken by yourself and by your worthy colleagues, that is now on record; and whether this stand was worth

while can safely be left to the decision of all those whose good opinion is worth having.

Let me answer the personal attack first: The premise upon which this attack was made was that some 25 years ago I advocated a duty on agricultural exports. This is not the case. I never advocated anything of the kind, as my public utterances on the subject, in print in the leading journals of the United States, clearly show. It was a bounty, not a duty, on exports that I advocated. (Please see addenda A.) So much for the personal attack.

And now for the institute: The debate on the floor shows that the objections offered were altogether due to a lack of information. Had my annual reports to the State Department been printed and distributed to Members of Congress they would have supplied the information required.

The objectors would have us infer that the institute's labors have been brought to a standstill by the war. This is not the case. The war has not stopped or curtailed the work. The meetings of the permanent committee, on which each country is represented by one delegate, are held regularly. Each of the bureaux, with its staff of employees (about 100 in all) is performing its functions as before the war; in fact, the work of the institute is going on with increased activity. This work is similar in character to that done by the United States Department of Agriculture and by the Department of Commerce, but instead of being on national lines it is on international lines; it is done for the world.

None of the belligerent nations have abrogated the treaty; all the 55 adhering Governments are full members, as before the war. Communications with the central Empires, by Government permission, go on regularly through Switzerland, and the temporary withholding of their crop-reporting data is of no moment so long as they are cut off from international trade.

And now let me briefly explain the work the institute is doing and its economic importance.

But before doing so I would ask you to bring to mind events of some 10 years ago. Then, as to-day, the people prayed, "Give us this day our daily bread," and the bread was given in abundance; but, alas, it was measured out, artificially reduced by sundry manipulations.

Do you remember the days of the Pattens, the Sullys, the Prices, and the Leiters? Do you remember how up to 10 years ago wheat, corn, cotton, and other staples of agriculture were cornered, were battledored and shuttlecocked on the home market and on the foreign markets, were footballed hither and thither by bull and by bear?

But during the past 10 years, since the institute began its labors, have you heard of any such corners? Have you heard of them in the home market? Have you heard of them in the foreign markets?

Why have they ceased?

They have ceased because the conditions which made such cornering possible have ceased.

What, then, were those conditions? Let us see.

The staples of agriculture, having a world market, are sold at a world price, just as stocks or bonds are sold in exchanges, bourses, or pits. This world price is determined by a knowledge of the available world supply. If the world's supply is above the normal the world's price will be low; if the supply is below the normal the price will be high. The world supply is made known by statistical information on the world area sown, on world conditions of growth, and on world harvest yields. Now, then, before the foundation of the institute, who gave out the figures for this world supply?

They were given out by sundry unofficial sources, some of which favored the bull interests, some the bear interests. The result was heterogeneous, conflicting summaries of the world supply, leading to conditions which made it possible to manipulate the world's prices and to corner the staples.

The International Institute of Agriculture has done away with this state of affairs. It has been delegated under treaty to gather in the crop-reporting data of the world. These it assembles, summarizes, and makes public.

Thus, in place of the former "sundry," the former "unofficial," the former "varying" summaries, which led to cornering the market, we now have, through the labors of this institute, the single, official, standard summary of the world's supply.

If the objectors had looked through the leading papers of the United States, indeed the leading papers of the world, they would have seen that the former private crop-reporting information, the information inspired by "bull" or "bear" interests, has disappeared, and in its place appear each month the official standard crop reports of the institute. Please see inclosed sample of clippings just received.

The institute's crop reports thus afford the official, authoritative basis for world price formation for the staples. To do away with them would be to return to the "sundry," the "unofficial," and the "varying" summaries; it would be to return to the cornering of the supplies.

But can not the Department of Agriculture supply this world summary? It can only do so after receiving it from the institute.

But could not the department gather the information direct from the nations of the world, assemble it, and give it out to the press just as is done by the institute?

No; it could not. It might obtain the information as a favor from a few of the nations, but there would have to be a treaty agreement before each of them would hold itself bound to supply such information regularly at the fixed dates required. Without such treaty the department might receive some heterogeneous data, largely incomparable, which it would have to try to reduce to its own standards before it could obtain its summaries. And even if the department could overcome all these difficulties—and I doubt very much if it could—its summaries would only then be official in the United States; they would not be "official" in other countries; hence they would not be "official" for the commerce of the world; they would not be the standard for determining the world's price of the staples. Thus they could not serve the purpose intended in the United States nor anywhere else.

Would the commerce of the United States accept a world summary got up by the Board of Agriculture of England as the official world summary? No; for it would be inferred that England as a buyer would be biased in favor of buyers. Would the commerce of England accept a world summary got up by our Department of Agriculture as the official world summary? No; for it would be inferred that the United States as a seller would be biased in favor of sellers. And the other countries would accept neither the one nor the other as the official summary.

The official summary acceptable to the commerce of all the nations of the world may only be had under treaty binding each nation to send in its crop reports in a stated manner, at a stated time, to a stated place, and under and in accordance with the international agreement laid down in that treaty.

(Caption View) A Flew in the Y-100

The Independent, February 26, 1917, p. 336

McWarren
Editor

YAL P 11

Americanization Day

IN THE INDIANA PUBLIC SCHOOLS

ON OCTOBER 24, 1919



"One flag, the American flag; one language, the language of the Declaration of Independence; one loyalty, loyalty to the American People."—Theodore Roosevelt.

PUBLISHED BY THE INDIANA STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION, 1919

Americanization Day

Officially Designated

"WHEREAS, During the week of October 20th to 27th, the Roosevelt Memorial Association will conduct a national campaign for five million dollars, to be used in erecting a fitting memorial to that great exponent of courageous Americanism—Theodore Roosevelt; and,

WHEREAS, During this critical period of readjustment America needs, above all things, the same unselfish devotion to duty, the same unfaltering patriotism and the same bravery in the face of adversity as exemplified in Colonel Roosevelt's daily life. Therefore, be it

Resolved, By the State Board of Education, that Friday, October 24th, be proclaimed as Americanization Day in all public schools in Indiana in honor of Theodore Roosevelt's birthday, thereby reminding the present generation that loyalty to government, service to humanity and love of country, however splendid in war, are even more essential in peace.

The State Superintendent of Public Instruction is hereby authorized to appoint a committee of educators whose duty it shall be to prepare a suggestive program suitable to the occasion and which shall include authorization of the acceptance by school authorities and teachers of such voluntary contributions as the youth of Indiana may desire to make to the Memorial Fund.

The State Superintendent is further authorized to have printed in sufficient quantity for general distribution throughout the schools of the State, the suggestive program for celebrating Americanization Day as outlined by the above committee. Be it further .

Resolved, That all school authorities, teachers and pupils of both public and private schools be earnestly urged to avail themselves of the opportunity for doing honor to the memory of this American, not that he needs any monument to make secure his name in history, but that his manly qualities of courage, energy, unselfish service, love of country, honor and square dealing, righteousness and wisdom, may be fused into the life and spirit of American youth."

Adopted by the Indiana State Board of Education, September 16, 1919.

LINNAEUS N. HINES,

State Superintendent of Public Instruction.

Endorsed by:

MRS. HENCE ORME,

President Indiana Parent-Teacher Association.

MISS BELLE O'HAIR,

President State Federation of Teachers.

PROGRAM

Americanization Day

October 24, 1919



Star-Spangled Banner.....	All
Invocation.	
Keep the Home Fires Burning.....	All
Solo	Selected
Roosevelt's Younger Life.....	Composition
The Rough Rider.....	Composition
Roosevelt as President.....	Composition
America	Primary Grades
Reading: Gov. Ralston's Tribute.	
Explanation of Americanization Week, with report of school's contribution.	
Unveiling of Roosevelt's picture as audience sings Battle Hymn of Republic.	
American Ideals as defined by Washington, Lincoln, Roosevelt and President Wilson.	
Address or Readings from Roosevelt.....	Selected
Onward, Christian Soldiers.....	All
Dismissal.	

(NOTE: The above is offered as a suggestive program only, subject to such revision or elimination as may occur to the mind of the teacher.)

Compiled and edited by

ELLIS U. GRAFF,
Superintendent Indianapolis Public Schools.

A TRIBUTE TO ROOSEVELT

By HON. SAMUEL M. RALSTON,

Twenty-seventh Governor of Indiana.

A vibrant and vigorous voice which had become familiar to the American people, is silent. An impressive form whose presence had inspired multitudes, now rests at Sagamore Hill. "After life's fitful fever he sleeps well." Theodore Roosevelt is dead, but our country can not afford to forget him.

Mr. Roosevelt was not an ordinary man. He was an unique and picturesque character. Emerson's idea of a great man fits him well:

"He is great who is what he is from nature and who never reminds us of others."

Whether we consider Roosevelt as a statesman, as a soldier, as a historian, or as a lover of nature, we institute no comparisons. We analyzed what he did and made our estimate of him from our conclusion on his performances. He had a strong individuality and a striking initiative. He drove directly at the object he had in view along lines of his own choosing. He did not look to others for leadership. He went in front.

Briefly, let us catalogue some of the events of his life. The two common to all men, of course, were his birth and his death. The one occurred in 1858 and the other in 1919. He lived but 61 years, a mere span, but he crowded it with deeds that encourage and inspire.

He was graduated from Harvard at the age of twenty-two. The year following he was elected to the New York Legislature, was twice re-elected and was a candidate of the minority for Speaker in the second term. In 1884 he was chosen a delegate to the Republican National Convention. The two years following, on account of his health, he spent in raising cattle in North Dakota. In 1888 he was an unsuccessful candidate for Mayor of New York. He was appointed Civil Service Commissioner in 1889 and served till 1895, when he resigned to become president of the Police Commission of New York City. In 1897 he became Assistant Secretary of the Navy, and served as such until 1898, when he resigned and organized the Roosevelt Rough Riders. He became their Colonel and served in the war in Cuba. He was elected Gov-

ernor of New York in 1898. Two years later he was nominated for Vice-President of the United States. He succeeded to the Presidency in September, 1901, upon the death of President McKinley. He was unanimously nominated for President and elected for the term 1905-1909. He was awarded the Nobel Peace Prize in 1906. After retiring from the Presidency he led an expedition to East Africa for the Smithsonian and National Museums at Washington. In 1910, on his return home through Europe, he was widely acclaimed and the receptions given him were magnificent.

In 1912 he was again a candidate for President. During this campaign he was shot, while at Milwaukee, by an anarchist, but fortunately the wound inflicted proved not to be dangerous.

Mr. Roosevelt wrote much. We wonder how it was possible for him to accomplish what he did in the literary field when we consider his activities in other lines.

It was his philosophy of life that a man can afford to wear out but not to rust out. Through service he pressed forward and it would seem that at the time of his death he was never more ambitious to be of service to his fellowmen.

But this characterization of him applies to him in the maturity of his years. As a boy he was not only retiring but sickly, and he wanted it understood that in his boyhood and school days he was of but average ability.

He tells us in his autobiography that his father was the best man he ever knew and that he combined strength and courage with gentleness, tenderness and great unselfishness; that he would not tolerate in his children selfishness, cruelty or cowardice, or untruthfulness, and that he made his children understand that what was wrong in a woman could not be right in a man.

If we accept his own estimate of his ability as a boy, coupled with his impaired physical condition, his achievements in public life are thereby magnified, and they make him a character that should be memorialized. Such a life is a striking illustration of what indomitable grit can accomplish under very great disadvantages.

We can not here make a review of this marvelous man's record as President of this nation. As chief executive he was

a man of strength and with a vision. A volume could be written on his advocacy of a clean public service.

Mr. Roosevelt was a great statesman. He was a leader who inspired the masses and they followed him. He was a man of fine virtues and strong characteristics. The most impressive and indomitable thing in his life was his intense Americanism. He loved his country and her institutions with all his heart and all his mind and all his soul.

He grew impatient because his country did not resent Germany's insult sooner than it did, but when it finally declared war he became a flaming sword back of our war declaration and back of the boys who went to the front. No American youth will read the story of this man's life without becoming a better citizen than he otherwise would have been.

The duty of the American people is therefore clear. They must speak to future generations, through memorials, of his imperishable services to mankind.

THEODORE ROOSEVELT.

Born in New York City.....	Oct. 27, 1858
Elected to Assembly, New York State.....	Nov. 8, 1881
Appointed U. S. Civil Service Commissioner.....	May 7, 1889
Appointed N. Y. Police Commissioner.....	May 6, 1895
Nominated Assistant Secretary of Navy.....	Apr. 6, 1897
Appointed Lieut. Col. First Vol. Cavalry (Rough Riders).....	May 6, 1898
Elected Governor New York.....	Nov. 8, 1898
Elected Vice-President of U. S.....	Nov. 6, 1900
Succeeded McKinley as President of U. S.....	Sept. 14, 1901
Elected President of U. S.....	Nov. 8, 1904
Died	Jan. 6, 1919

Roosevelt an Inspiration to Youth

Adapted from Herman Hagedorn's Book
"THE BOY'S LIFE OF THEODORE ROOSEVELT."

That the youthful Roosevelt experienced the same thrills and emotions that come to other children is perhaps best illustrated by the incident that dealt with the monster he called the "zeal." It happened one day that he was playing tag in Madison Square, a pleasant park, at the side of which stood a Presbyterian church. His spirit of adventure drew him irresistably to the church door, where he was discovered by the sexton and invited within.

"No, thank you," replied Theodore to the cordial invitation, and when asked why he hesitated he added, "I know

what you've got in there." Finally he was coaxed inside, and again at later dates he manifested an eager curiosity, but he never ventured inside alone. He told his mother about the hospitable sexton, but he avoided a discussion of his own timidity. Finally he admitted that he was afraid lest the "zeal" should jump out and "get" him. His mother was puzzled and the explanation was deferred until she accidentally came upon an understanding of what her boy meant, when he said he had heard the minister read out of the Bible about the "zeal." The mother began her search, and finally while reading from the Psalms, was interrupted by the excited boy, who declared, "That's it, that's it," after his mother had recited, "For the zeal of thy house hath eaten me up." Theodore did not care to face a like fate.

At nine Theodore began keeping a diary. In an awkward hand he wrote:

"August 15th, Saturday. All the morning I played store and 'baby.' In the afternoon I wrote, read and drew. That afternoon I received a continuance of Washington's life." And again: "August 16th. Sunday. I went to church. After lunch I did nothing. August 17th. Monday. Today we discovered a little house with one room, one door and one window."

Theodore began his nature studies about this time, and with great seriousness started the Roosevelt Museum of Natural History. On a tablet somewhat similar to that in which he kept his diary he wrote "Natural history on insects. By Theodore Roosevelt, Jr.," and he assures his readers in the preface: "All these insects are native of North America. Most of the insects are not in other books."

Following illustrations by the author, he wrote:

"P. S. My home is in North America. All these stories were gained by observation. Age, nine years. Born, 28th of October."

Something of the impression he made on his companions may be gathered from the description of young Theodore by his cousin, Maud Elliott, aged eleven, who wrote in his copy-book, under the title "The Birthday," in part as follows:

"Well my dear little friends I must tell you something about Theodore, you know he was a naturalist on a small scale, he was a very amusing boy but he had a great fault he was very absent minded so much so that whenever his mother would tell him to go and do something for her he would say "Oh yes you pretty little thing," but instead of doing it directly he would go and skin his birds or something that

he took into his head to skin, and then he always thought that he could do things better than anyone else."

His sense of fair play is indicated by his action during a boxing bout. His opponent was charged by the spectators with having committed a foul, after the referee had called "time" and Roosevelt had dropped his hands in response to the call. However, Roosevelt insisted that his companion in the ring had not heard the referee call "time" and that his opponent was therefore blameless. He insisted that the bout go on, even though the blow, which was delivered during his unguarded moment, was causing blood to flow freely. The bout did go on and the blow was avenged by Theodore giving his combatant a sound drubbing.

It is said that Roosevelt's friends insisted that politics were "low" and that he would disgrace himself by engaging in municipal affairs in New York. His reply was:

"If they're too hard bit for me I suppose I'll have to quit. But I do not intend to quit until I have made an effort and have found out whether I actually am too weak to hold my own in the rough and tumble."

His biographer says of the Roosevelt children:

"Theodore Roosevelt had a rare way of stimulating their sports and entering, as an equal and contemporary, into the pleasures and sorrows and thrills of boy-and-girl life. As a boy, he himself had loved to explore and hunt and ride and play in the water. He had, in fact, never ceased loving these things."

"He was, with all his learning and with all his experience and knowledge of men, still an unusually simple-hearted and, in the deepest sense, unsophisticated boy. Like Peter Pan, he had never grown up. At forty, as President of the United States, he was applying to the tangled problems of government the ardor, the energy and the unclouded standards of boyhood."

American Ideals of Roosevelt

An Appreciation,

By WILLIAM DUDLEY FOULKE.

There never was a great American who showed his intense Americanism, either in his words or in his life, more clearly than Theodore Roosevelt. His declarations upon this subject were very plain long before he became President. He appreciated to the full the great opportunities of our country.

"Our nation is that one among all the nations of the earth which holds in its hand the fate of the coming years."

"We shall never be successful over the dangers that confront us, we shall never achieve true greatness, nor reach the lofty ideals which the founders and preservers of our mighty federal republic have set before us unless we are Americans in heart and soul, in spirit and purpose, keenly alive to the responsibilities implied in the very name of American and proud beyond measure in the glorious privilege of bearing it."—*Forum*, April, 1894.

"Americanism is a question of spirit, conviction and purpose, not of creed or birthplace. * * *

"A Scandinavian, a German or an Irishman, who has really become an American, has the right to stand upon exactly the same footing as the native-born citizen."—*Forum*, April, 1894.

"As regards every race, everywhere, at home or abroad, we cannot afford to deviate from the great rule of righteousness which bids us treat each man on his worth as a man."—*Address at University of Oxford*.

While Mr. Roosevelt was President he preserved this equality of treatment of all classes.

"The door of the White House while I am President," he said, "shall swing *just as easily* to the pressure of the hand of labor as of the hand of capital, *and no easier*."

"The reckless labor agitator who arouses the mob to riot and bloodshed is in the last analysis the most dangerous of the workingman's enemies. This man is a real peril and so is his sympathizer, the legislator who, to catch votes, denounces the judiciary and the military because they put down mobs. * * *

"The demagogue in all his forms is as characteristic an evil of all free society as the courier is of a despotism."—*Forum*, February, 1895.

"No man works such incalculable woe to a free country as he who teaches young men that one of the paths to glory, renown and temporal success lies along the line of armed resistance to the government, or its attempted overthrow."—*Forum*, February, 1895.

"It is just as un-American to vote against a man because he is rich as to vote against him because he is poor."—*Forum*, April, 1894.

"When once loyalty to a class has been substituted for loyalty to the republic, the end of the republic is at hand."—*Sorbonne, Paris*, April 23, 1910.

After he had ceased to be President he spread his gospel of democratic ideals among other nations.

Thus he said to the people of France in his address at the Sorbonne:

"The average citizen must be a good citizen if our republics are to succeed. The stream will not rise permanently higher than the main source of national power and national greatness is found in the average citizenship of the nation. Therefore, it behooves us to do our best to see that the standard of the average citizen is kept high and the average cannot be kept high unless the standard of the leaders is very much higher."

And he shows the way in which this is to be done by action and by manly co-operation, not by mere criticism of what others are doing.

"The poorest way to face life is to face it with a sneer. * * *

"It is not the critic who counts, not the man who points out how the strong man stumbles or where the doer of deeds could have done them better. The credit belongs to the man who is actually in the arena, whose face is marred by dust and sweat and blood; who strives valiantly; who errs, and comes short again and again, because there is no effort without error and shortcoming; but who does actually strive to do the deeds; who knows the great enthusiasms, the great devotions; who spends himself in a worthy cause; who at the best knows in the end the triumph of high achievement, and who at the worst, if he fails, at least fails while daring greatly, so that his place shall never be with those cold and timid souls who know neither victory nor defeat."—*Sorbonne, April 23, 1919.*

But high as were the aims of Mr. Roosevelt he was still the most practical of statemen.

"We believe that our ideals should be high, but not so high as to make it impossible measurably to realize them."—*Sorbonne, Paris, 1919.*

His views in respect to war and securing the peace of the world ought to be known to all.

"War is a dreadful thing, and unjust war is a crime against humanity. But it is such a crime because it is unjust, not because it is war. The choice must ever be in favor of righteousness, and this whether the alternative be peace or whether the alternative be war."—*Sorbonne, Paris, 1919.*

"Unjust war is to be abhorred; but woe to the nation that does not make ready to hold its own in time of need against all who would harm it! And who thrice over to the nation in which the average man loses the fighting edge, loses the power to serve as a soldier if the day of need should arise."—*Address to University of Berlin.*

It was Roosevelt who brought the parties together and secured the peace in the war between Russia and Japan. For this he received the Nobel peace prize at Christiania. In his address on that occasion he said:

"I cannot help thinking that the Constitution of the United States notably in the establishment of the Supreme Court and in the methods adopted for securing peace and good relations among and between the different States, offers certain valuable analogies to what should be striven for in order to secure, through The Hague courts and conferences, a species of world federation for international peace and justice."

"Finally, it would be a master stroke if those great Powers honestly bent on peace would form a League of Peace, not only to keep the peace among themselves, but to prevent, by force if necessary, it being broken by others."—*Nobel Peace Prize*.

Perhaps the most eloquent expression of Theodore Roosevelt for true Americanism is found in the conclusion of his great speech at Carnegie Hall in 1912 on the right of the people to rule:

"We, here in America, hold in our hands the hope of the world, the fate of the coming years; and shame and disgrace will be ours if in our eyes the light of high resolve is dimmed, if we trail in the dust the golden hopes of men. If on this new continent we merely build another country of great but unjustly divided material prosperity, we shall have done nothing; and we shall do as little if we merely set the greed and envy against the great and arrogant, and thereby destroy the material well-being of all of us. To turn this government into government by plutocracy or government by a mob would be to repeat on a larger scale the lamentable failures of the world that is dead. We stand against all tyranny, by the few or by the many. We stand for the rule of the many in the interest of all of us, for the rule of the many in the spirit of courage, of common sense, of high purpose, above all, in a spirit of kindly justice towards every man and every woman."

American Ideals of Washington

By PROF. JAMES A. WOODBURN, Indiana University.

Fortunately in America in 1783 the spirit of English liberty still lived. Washington, the patriot leader, held himself to be not the master, but the servant of the people. He revered the law and he held the law in honor above his military power. He appeared in the council of the American officers to check mob violence and lawless discontent, and there occurred one of the most dramatic scenes in American history. The noble leader's eyesight was failing, and, as he adjusted his glasses, he said:

"Gentlemen, you will permit me to put on my spectacles, for I have not only grown gray, but almost blind, in the service of my country. * * * Let me conjure you in the name of our common country,

as you value your sacred honor, as you respect the rights of humanity and as you regard the military and national character of America, to express your utmost horror and detestation of the man who wishes, under any specious pretenses, to overturn the liberties of our country and who wickedly attempts to open the floodgates of civil discord and deluge our rising empire in blood."

The veterans who heard these words had borne the heat and burden of the war. They gave one more proof of their unexampled patriotism. They recognized their obligations to civil property and proved themselves to be loyal subjects of the law. They trusted their government, went to their homes in good order without a settlement of their accounts, many of them without a farthing of money in their pockets. Washington then secured from Congress some recognition of their claims. Such was the ideal of liberty under law to which Washington appealed and to which his men responded.

Not long after the revolution was Washington allowed to live in quiet retirement. The States were falling apart; the central government was weak and helpless; trade was deranged; the public credit was low; Congress could not preserve order nor raise taxes, nor borrow money, nor enforce treaties. America had no standing among the nations of the world. For these reasons it was necessary to hold a convention in order to form a new constitution.

Washington was called from Mt. Vernon to be President of this convention. He had been told that the people would not approve as good a government as he thought was necessary. He replied:

"Let us erect a standard to which the wise and prudent may repair and leave the result in the hand of God."

He had faith in the people, believing that they would adopt a government strong enough to enforce the law and preserve their own liberties.

Washington was a devoutly religious man. He believed that the foundations of the nation rested upon "the eternal rules of order and right which Heaven itself has ordained."

Having served one term in the Presidency, he was elected for a second. Had he chosen to accept the honor he might have been elected for a third term, but he had resolved to decline again to be a candidate. He wished to retire to pri-

vate life, and, as the time approached for the election, he gave to the people his immortal Farewell Address.

Following are some of the passages from this famous address:

"Observe good faith and justice toward all Nations; cultivate peace and harmony with all. Religion and morality enjoin this conduct; and can it be, that good policy does not equally enjoin it? It will be worthy of a free, enlightened, and, at no distant period, a great Nation, to give to mankind the magnanimous and too novel example of a people always guided by an exalted justice and benevolence."

"It is our true policy to steer clear of permanent alliances with any portion of the foreign world; so far, I mean, as we are now at liberty to do it; for let me not be understood as capable of patronizing infidelity to existing engagements. I hold the maxim no less applicable to public than to private affairs, that honesty is always the best policy. I repeat it, therefore, let those engagements be observed in their genuine sense."

There is no better rule for promoting true citizenship in America than that the children of our schools and all who come from foreign lands should cultivate the spirit of Washington and imitate his noble example.

American Ideals of Lincoln

By CHARLES W. MOORES,

Author of *Life of Abraham Lincoln for Boys and Girls*.

Lincoln's political ideals all rest upon the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States. The speech from which the following is taken was an appeal to foreign-born Americans to accept the spirit of the Declaration of Independence, the spirit of '76 as the controlling influence in their lives.

"We have * * * among us * * * men who have come from Europe * * * and settled here, finding themselves our equal in all things. If they look back through this history to trace their connection with those days of blood, they find they have none; they cannot carry themselves back into that glorious epoch and make themselves feel that they are part of us; but when they look through that old Declaration of Independence, they find that those old men say that "We hold these truths to be self-evidence, that all men are created equal," and then they feel that that moral sentiment taught in that day evidences their relation to those men, that it is the father of all moral principle in them, and that they have a right to claim it as though they were blood of the blood, and flesh of the flesh, of the men who wrote that Declaration, and so they are. That is the electric cord in that Declaration that links the

hearts of patriotic and liberty-loving men together, that will link those patriotic hearts as long as the love of freedom exists in the minds of men throughout the world."—*Chicago, July 10, 1858.*

America's Present Duty

There is in this noblest utterance in American literature, the spirit of self-effacement and of service to others that savors of the divine. It ought to express the spirit of America and of all civilized peoples now that the peace of the world begins to be possible again.

"With malice toward none; with charity for all; with firmness in the right, as God gives us to see the right, let us strive on to finish the work we are in; to bind up the nation's wounds; to care for him who shall have borne the battle, and for his widow, and his orphan—to do all which may achieve and cherish a just and lasting peace among ourselves, and with all nations.—*Second Inaugural, March 4, 1865.*

Public Opinion America's Only Ruler

The Union was preserved and government under the Constitution was made secure for all time because the President believed in public opinion and trusted the average man to uphold what was right. He adopted no policy until he felt convinced that the average patriotic American would approve it.

"Our government rests in public opinion. Whoever can change public opinion can change the government practically just so much."—*Chicago, December 19, 1856.*

"I happen, temporarily, to occupy this White House. I am a living witness that any one of your children may look to come here as my father's child has. It is in order that each one of you may have, through this free government which we have enjoyed, an open field and a fair chance for your industry, enterprise, and intelligence; that you may all have equal privileges in the race of life, with all its desirable human aspirations. It is for this the struggle should be maintained, that we may not lose our birthright * * * The nation is worth fighting for, to secure such an inestimable jewel."

Thrift and Labor Will Win

That America generously rewards labor and thrift is proved by Lincoln's own career. His boyhood was spent in hunger and cold and want and yet his hardships did not embitter him. He made a decent living for his family and won for himself the first place in American history. Hard work and high ideals did it.

"Again, as has already been said, there is not, of necessity, any such thing as the free hired laborer being fixed to that condition for life. Many independent men everywhere in these States, a few years back in their lives, were hired laborers. The prudent, penniless beginner in the world labors for wages a while, saved a surplus with which to buy tools or land for himself, then labors on his own account another while, and at length hires another new beginner to help him. This is the just and generous and prosperous system which opens the way to all—gives hope to all, and consequent energy and progress and improvement of condition to all. No men living are more worthy to be trusted than those who toil up from poverty—none less inclined to take or touch aught which they have not honestly earned."—*Message to Congress, December 3, 1861.*

"I am always for the man who wishes to work."—*Endorsement of Application for Employment, August 15, 1864.*

How a Young Man Gets Ahead

This is from a letter written to his young partner at the law, William H. Herndon, who imagined that other people were trying to injure him and whose success in life like that of many another was threatened because he lacked Lincoln's cheerful outlook and faith in others:

"The way for a young man to rise is to improve himself every way he can, never suspecting that anybody wishes to hinder him. Allow me to assure you that suspicion and jealousy never did help any man in any situation. There may sometimes be ungenerous attempts to keep a young man down; and they will succeed, too, if he allows his mind to be diverted from its true channel to brood over the attempted injury."—*Letter to William H. Herndon, July 10, 1848.*

American Ideals of Wilson

By MEREDITH NICHOLSON,

Author of "The Valley of Democracy."

Only Lincoln of our Presidents has faced greater difficulties and perils than those confronted by President Wilson. No other President has been so great a figure in the affairs of the world. He is the eighth President to be born in Virginia, the place being Staunton; the day, December 28, 1856. He was graduated from Princeton in 1879, and later received the degree of Doctor of Philosophy at Johns Hopkins University.

He practiced law for a year at Atlanta, Georgia, but abandoned the profession to become a teacher at Bryn Mawr and Wesleyan Universities before going to Princeton, where he was one of the distinguished professors and later presi-

dent of that institution. He had never engaged actively in politics until his nomination and election as Governor of New Jersey. While serving in this office, he received the nomination of the Democratic party for the presidency and was elected in 1912 and re-elected in 1916. From the hour that Germany began the war for world domination, President Wilson's great task was first to keep us out of war if possible, and then, when the Kaiser's insolence became intolerable, to call America to take up arms and contribute her power in men and wealth to defeat Germany and make the world "safe for democracy."

President Wilson's rare gifts as a writer and speaker, through these wonderful years, have challenged the admiration of the world. The following extracts, taken from some of his most impressive addresses, give only slight hints of his felicity and vigor as an orator:

"America will never be the aggressor, America will always seek to the last point at which her honor is involved to avoid the things which disturb the peace of the world; but America does not control the circumstances of the world, and we must be sure that we are faithful servants of those things which we love, and are ready to defend them against every contingency that may affect or impair them."—*Before the Railway Business Association, New York City, January 27, 1916.*

"The thing that everybody is listening for in a democracy is the tramp, tramp, tramp of the facts and the people."—*The Western Preparedness Tour: At Kansas City, Mo., February 2, 1916.*

"I believe in the ordinary man. If I did not believe in the ordinary man I would move out of a democracy and, if I found an endurable monarchy, I would live in it."—*At the Salesmanship Congress (luncheon), Detroit, July 10, 1916.*

"The Commands of Democracy are imperative as its privileges and opportunities are wide and generous. Its compulsion is upon us. It will be great and lift a great light for the guidance of the nations only if we are great and carry that light high for the guidance of our own feet. We are not worthy to stand here unless we ourselves be in deed and in truth real democrats and servants of mankind, ready to give our very lives for the freedom and justice and spiritual exaltation of the great nation which shelters and nurtures us."—*Address on Lincoln: At the formal acceptance of the Lincoln Memorial built over the Log-Cabin Birthplace at Hodgenville, Ky., September 4, 1916.*

"It is plain enough how we were forced into the war. The extraordinary insults and aggressions of the Imperial German Government left us no self-respecting choice but to take up arms in defense of our rights as a free people and of our honor as a sovereign government.

The military masters of Germany denied us the right to be neutral. They filled our unsuspecting communities with vicious spies and conspirators and sought to corrupt the opinion of our people in their own habits."—*Flag Day Address, Washington, D. C., June 14, 1917.*

"For only where men are free do they think the thoughts of comradeship, only where they are free do they think the thoughts of sympathy, only where they are free do they realize their dependence upon one another and their comradeship in a common interest and common necessity."—*Address opening the Campaign in New York for the second Red Cross Fund, May 18, 1918.*

"I can never accept any man as a champion of liberty, either for ourselves or for the world, who does not reverence and obey the laws of our own beloved land, whose laws we ourselves have made. He has adopted the standards of the enemies of his country, whom he affects to despise."—*Denunciation of Lynchings and the Mob Spirit, July 26, 1918.*

"You cannot dedicate yourself to America unless you become in every respect and with every purpose of your will thorough Americans. You cannot become thorough Americans if you think of yourselves in groups. America does not consist of groups. A man who thinks of himself as belonging to a particular national group in America has not yet become an American, and the man who goes among you to trade upon your nationality is no worthy son to live under the Stars and Stripes."—*Address to Several Thousand Foreign-born Citizens, after Naturalization Ceremonies, at Philadelphia, May 10, 1915.*

The Roosevelt Memorial Association in the Schools of Indiana

Friday, October 24th, which comes three days before the anniversary of Theodore Roosevelt's birth, should be observed in every school in Indiana as Americanization Day and should be made the occasion of a state-wide lesson in the loyal Americanism which characterized Theodore Roosevelt's life and which commands the admiration of all patriotic Americans.

During this same week the Roosevelt Memorial Association will conduct a national campaign for a memorial fund for \$5,000,000.00, to be devoted to the following purposes:

First: To build a splendid monument at Washington, D. C.

Second: To establish a national shrine at Oyster Bay, Long Island, the home of the former President.

Third: To acquire, restore and maintain Theodore Roosevelt's birthplace in New York City.

Fourth: Through an endowed foundation to perpetuate Roosevelt's ideals of courageous Americanism.

Indiana's quota for the national fund is \$200,000.00. The National Executive Committee has been requested to permit all over-subscriptions in this State to be used exclusively for a memorial to Roosevelt in Indiana. What this memorial shall be has not yet been determined but it is proposed that the bulk of the Indiana fund be devoted to some form of memorial in the nature of Americanization or welfare work which will be state-wide in character and benefit.

The Indiana State Executive Committee has established \$200,000.00 as the goal to be reached in oversubscriptions to be devoted to the exclusively Indiana memorial to Theodore Roosevelt.

It is peculiarly fitting that the school children of Indiana should contribute to this fund. Theodore Roosevelt was the hero of millions of American boys and girls and will always be enshrined in the hearts of American youth. They will be found eager to do their full share in erecting a memorial to him—if the purposes of the Roosevelt Memorial Association are presented to them fully.

The school children of America had a very large share in paying for the Lincoln Memorial, and it is expected that they will respond equally as enthusiastically and generously to this appeal.

Each pupil who contributes to the memorial fund will have his or her name placed in the cornerstone of the monument at Washington. This should be a source of patriotic pride in years to come.

Contributions

Contributions in any sum from one penny on up are acceptable and it is suggested that all teachers carefully explain to their pupils the plans and purposes of the Roosevelt Memorial Fund previous to the celebration of Americanization Day in order that the pupils may come prepared to make their contributions on Friday, October 24th, which day has been officially designated by the State Board of Education.

It is not expected that large gifts will be made in this way to the memorial, but it is hoped that every pupil will give a small amount. In no better manner can each Hoosier boy and girl be made to feel a personal interest in safeguarding

American liberties. Each contribution will be an expression of patriotic devotion and loyalty to American ideals.

Each school which makes a contribution to the Roosevelt Memorial Fund will receive a signed certificate for framing, size 11 x 14, as a permanent evidence of its share in the National Memorial.

Each schoolroom which makes a one hundred per cent contribution will receive a handsome photogravure portrait of Theodore Roosevelt, suitable for framing.

Each teacher should give a list of the names of all pupils who contribute, together with the money received, to the school principal, who should forward same as soon as possible to the Roosevelt Memorial Association, 207 Hume-Mansur Building, Indianapolis, Indiana. The principal should notify the Memorial Association which rooms have made a one hundred per cent contribution, in order that the portraits of Roosevelt may be forwarded promptly. Checks should be made payable to Albert Sahm, Treasurer, and should accompany the school report.

STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION OF INDIANA,

LINNAEUS N. HINES, President.

E. U. GRAFF.

W. W. PARSONS.

W. E. STONE.

W. L. BRYAN.

GEO. R. GROSE.

L. P. BENEZET.

C. O. WILLIAMS.

A. M. HALL.

R. W. HIMELICK.

MRS. E. E. OLCOTT.

H. L. FIDLER.

CLIFFORD FUNDERBURG.

Roosevelt, the American



While he lived, Theodore Roosevelt was recognized as the foremost American of his day. In word and deed he inspired in his countrymen a veneration for the principles which are fundamental in a representative government. His voice served as the very conscience of patriotism. In death, Theodore Roosevelt's personality and his force serve but to lead to higher and nobler civic attainments. For so long as the American people select their own public officials, and I trust that means for all time to come, so long will there remain the splendid heritage of a noble example, a power for righteousness and the square deal in the story of the life and the works of this great man.

I can think of no more appropriate recognition of this fact than that it be brought with full force and understanding to the school children of the nation. And in consideration of this thought, I hereby call upon the educators of the state to lend their time and talents to the proper recognition of his birthday and to assist the school children of Indiana in paying appropriate tribute to his memory. There can be no more effective instruction in patriotism, no better illustration of what this nation stands for; than an intelligent appreciation of his character and his deeds.

JAMES P. GOODRICH,

Governor.

*Executive Chamber, State House,
October 1, 1919.*

